



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



32101 063702623

~~ANNEX-LIB~~

5707

.692

10.06

Laurance F. Bower  
New York  
19. March 1895.

Library of



Princeton University.

Request of  
Laurance F. Bower  
Class of '96







# **DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.**

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

## INSTITUTES OF CANON LAW.

Price 10s. 6d.

J. T. HAYES, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.

LONDON. 1884.

'As a learned and comprehensive collection of facts and references, frequently illustrated with impartiality and judgment, it adds another contribution of value to a branch of literature still very meagre in works of interest to the English student.'

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[This review wrongly assumes a Roman bias in the author, and that in a passage (p. 26, 'Institutes') where he exposes the partiality of so moderate a writer as Fleury, and cannot see why *primò facie* a large majority is not *better* entitled than a small minority to be judge in its own case. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*.]

'There are some points which are vigorously contended for, and in which we are fully in accord with Mr. Owen. For instance, when he says he refuses to draw any fine distinctions between Roman and English Canon Law.'—LITERARY CHURCHMAN.

'Mr. Owen is a thorough canonist, a profound scholar, and possessed of considerable critical acumen; his style, however, is not without blemishes.'

THE CHURCH REVIEW.

'Those who are already fairly conversant with the subject-matter will find Mr. Owen often very helpful from the freshness and originality of his treatment.'

CHURCH TIMES, Jan. 27, 1884.

'One of two or three confused jumbles . . . learned, no doubt, after their fashion . . . but of no practical value.'—CHURCH TIMES, April 16, 1887.

'We cordially recommend his book to the younger clergy. It will be found far preferable to the jabber of the cheap church newspapers and their irresponsible wire-pullers—much more trustworthy and far less misleading. . . . Our author writes wisely and well, is always shrewd and pointed, and sometimes a little sarcastic, in his comments.'—JOHN BULL, May 31, 1884.

## SANCTORALE CATHOLICUM; OR, BOOK OF SAINTS.

Price 18s.

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, & CO., 1 Paternoster Square.

LONDON. 1880.

'Quaint and attractive volume. Mr. Owen's notes are often highly piquant and apply, most unexpectedly, many lessons of the past to present political and ecclesiastical difficulties. They have thus the personal interest that attaches to the incubrations of writers of an older school.'—CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

'Short and telling notices of the most memorable saints of the entire Church Catholic, including among them men dear to our English hearts . . . especially strong in local British saints.'—GUARDIAN.

'Quite the most compendious work of the sort we have seen.'—CHURCH TIMES.

'Written with extreme care and patience, testifying to the great learning and research brought to bear on its production.'—MORNING POST.

'Fifty notes, full of discursive learning.'—JOHN BULL.

## THE PILGRIMAGE TO ROME. A POEM IN TWO BOOKS.

(BEING A RECORD OF A CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN'S FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF  
THE ETERNAL CITY AND OF THE WAY THITHERWARDS.)

Originally published at Oxford in 1863, may be had of  
Mr. J. T. Hayes.

A TREATISE  
OF  
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY,

BY  
THE REV. ROBERT OWEN, B.D.

LATE FELLOW OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD;  
AUTHOR OF 'SANCTORALE CATHOLICUM,' 'INSTITUTES OF CANON LAW,'  
'ESSAY ON THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS,' ETC.

---

SECOND EDITION.

---



RECEIVED  
LIBRARY  
JAN 10 1887

LONDON:  
J. T. HAYES, 17 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

---

1887.

---

[All rights reserved.]

PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
LONDON

YTIBREVMU  
YRASBU  
L.M. NOTIONARY

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

OF

### AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

---

THE object of this work is to introduce the reader to the study of Positive or Dogmatic Theology. By *Dogma* is meant the teaching of the Church, set forth in precise terms and enjoined by public Authority, which at first was popularly current with general consent, and in that early stage called *Tradition*.

The Bishops of the Catholic Church were regarded as its guardians and depositaries. When disputes arose, they ruled what was matter of Faith, and it became dogma. Thus the questions touching the Creed were settled or silenced by synodical decisions in the fourth and fifth centuries. Few have been subsequently raised, which do not turn upon the resolution of those early controversies. Yet at times when men are forced to examine, a religious opinion previously quiescent may assume prominence, and influence communities for good or evil, according as it makes more or less for righteousness towards God. Thus at the Reformation numerous 'Confessions of Faith' cropt up, embracing portions of Catholic Dogma already briefly summed up in Creeds, together with large limitations of religious opinion

DEC 10 1914 322766

5707  
692  
(RECAP)

previously left open. Our 'Articles of Religion,' for instance, present points of Theology, which have never approached the dignity of 'Articles of Belief.' The Bishops in modern times pretend to no *secret* Deposit of Faith, as they did of old; it has long ago been converted into Dogma. In the Roman Church their corporate action seems to be confined to witnessing the decrees of an Infallible Chief. They have invoked the splendour of Authority to check the aberrations of Reason; but it is at the risk of imposing a treacherous silence on one of the combatants engaged in an internecine struggle. In the Greek Church, the torpid bees are presumed to thrive on honey stored up in the summer of their theological activity. Indeed, it may be remarked of most Christians who insist much on Mystery and *Reserve*; "Ils vantent beaucoup de mystère, mais c'est pour le révéler." (De Staël, *L'Allemagne*, Part III.) Insist on the acceptance or rejection of Transsubstantiation *e.g.*, and you forthwith rend the veil of Mystery. The Anglican Bishops rarely discuss dogmatic points; the State-connection and Public Opinion preclude their framing binding decrees. And if they attempted it, would their dogmatic decisions bind a Church which claims 'liberty of prophesying,' leaving its members such latitude "that whatsoever is not read in" Holy Scripture, "nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man . . . as an Article of the Faith"? (*Article VI.*)

A Church is *collectio Fidelium*, a company of believers. If believers, then can they not judge what they already accept. They may examine the grounds of their belief; but a judge should be impartial, and the believer is already committed; so that his judgment is limited to the rejection of theories subversive of the Faith he hath already professed.

In truth, it appears that the responsibility of government has checked the cultivation of theology by that Order, which

originally was its custodian. Origen the man of genius and Jerome the man of learning, priests, not bishops, were the great lights of Antiquity. Nearly all the Schoolmen were priests. So were most of our eminent divines of every school, from Hooker down to Pusey. The duties of the Bishops lie rather in the direction of ecclesiastical statesmanship. The occasion and utility of their intervention should be to promote the peace and maintain the common interest of the Church.

The basis of Anglican Theology is (presumably) the Book of Common Prayer; the *Lex orandi* is practically the *Lex credendi*; and it is Catholic, if we allow for defect corresponding with excess elsewhere, as compared with the standards of the early Church. But this *Lex credendi* has to reckon with the Articles of Religion, which in fact are found victorious in a case of possible collision.

Consequently, in spite of the alleged continuity of the modern with the mediæval Church of England, we find the Articles so worded and interpreted as to allow him who wills to securely contradict much that is expressed, more that is implied, in the Office-Book. The result is, that *Dogma* is treated as *Problem*, and a great discouragement dealt to such as would adhere to historic Christianity.

Since the age of 'Confessions of Faith' and 'Articles of Religion,' the Church of England has mainly produced controversialists. I lament that circumstances have helped to infuse a bitter and contemptuous tone into so much of what is admirable. Among the many merits of Laud's book against Fisher the Jesuit I would commend its freedom from this blemish. If we have of late improved, we owe it chiefly to three illustrious men, Edward Gibbon, Walter Scott, Cardinal Newman. The first by his incomparable History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire supplied students



with a compass to navigate the vast ocean of Church history, and enabled them to weigh the merits of appeal to an homogeneous 'Primitive Church,' covering alike the speculations of the third, and the rigid dogmatism of the sixth, centuries. The second taught Englishmen to cherish kindly feelings towards other Christians, and to respect Virtue, whether presented in a Roman or a Calvinian dress. The third, I trust, has revealed to Rome that good may come even out of Nazareth ; seeing all men reverence in him a heart true to our motherland, coupled with the highest mental endowments and the rare sanctity of an apostolic Christian.

Apart from controversial works, and in the way of constructive theology, we had only Pearson 'On the Creed,' a work more praised perhaps than cordially studied. Our divines generally, such as Bull, Waterland, &c., have rather excelled in exhaustive treatises on special subjects.

Thorndike's works have a peculiar value, not only because of their breadth and deep learning, but chiefly because they employ the Fathers with a manly freedom unknown to a later school ; they connect the traditional with the rationalistic class of divines ; and betray (as Laud and earlier writers do) acquaintance with the Schoolmen by precise statements, which are refreshing after the turgid rhetoric of the Latin Fathers. You may always detect the exclusive study of Augustine or Gregory by the mistiness of statement and the lack of cogent reasoning ; if the Schoolmen knew not the charms of Plato, they at least derived the fountains of Aristotle into barbaric channels to invigorate the thought of modern Europe. Great, however, as are Thorndike's merits, I am unable to accept his correction of S. Augustine ; nor do I concur in his condemnation of certain points as 'destructive to the foundation of faith,' where such men as More and Leibniz appear to me to have the better reason. (*True*

*Principle of Comprehension*, §. 11. See below, chap. XI. §§. 2, 3, ch. XIII. §. 6.)

It was with the hope of aiding a confessed want, that I first ventured to publish my 'Introduction' &c., fully aware of its imperfections. Perhaps I presumed on the influences then apparently in favour of Positive Theology. But I perceive that a Church professing to be 'National' must necessarily reflect the spirit of the Nation it claims to represent; and that of England appears to me to resent indifference to dogmatic teaching.

It proceeds partly from the thirst after novelty, intensified by the multifarious interests of the times. I observe a special repugnance to Augustinian teaching, and an ill-disguised impatience of the traditional dogmas concerning the Final Doom.

1. For the first, neither Predestinarians nor semi-Pelagians were in a strict sense *heretics*. Either party saw a prism of the Truth. But the Truth in this matter refuses the fetters of strictly logical propositions. Nor hath the Church finally pronounced where GOD hath kept silence.

Now while I cheerfully agree with Archbishop Laud, that the truth in those matters "is not determinable by any human reason in this life," and that no "expression can be so happy as to settle all these difficulties," (*Works*, Vol. VI. 292. vii. 275,) I cannot applaud the levity of the young Frenchman (M. De Sévigné,) who said of S. Augustine, (and so indirectly of S. Paul,) "These are Saints we could well dispense with;" nor think the clergy of the English Church justified in traversing the Articles they subscribe to ex animo on the most solemn occasions of their lives. Until those documents are withdrawn, none can justly charge them as 'hyper-Augustinian' who faithfully copy the very words of the Catholic Doctor of Grace. I at least have on three points

departed from him, 1, in suggesting reasons for Election above human knowledge, 2. and 3, in maintaining the salvability of unbaptized infants and of pious heathens. Herein I gladly confess my debt to Leibniz.

I may be confronted with the authority of Bishop Bull. With due respect I must prefer the teaching of Augustine and Bernard. (See below, chap. XX. §. 3.) Mabillon's canon (cited in my First Preface) binds me to do so. Not only have I greater confidence in their spiritual intuition and subjective knowledge of Holy Scripture, but I trace in Bull the sharp recoil from the vicious Augustinianism of the old Puritans: his dialectic, like that of the divines of George II.'s reign, concludes our reason, if Christianity were limited to what is demonstrable. He traces Predestination to the astrological conceits of the Pharisees. Be it they erred; yet truly did they perceive the mystery that shrouds the problem of human life, and, like Plato, felt that Virtue comes not of race or training simply, but of *a divine destiny*. He even seems to imply, that the notion of perseverance and indefectible grace originated with the Valentinian heretics. The question is, waving the perverse application of heretics, Is there any ground in Scripture for the notion? He dislikes others coupling him with Julian the Pelagian, as if his "opinion were the monstrous offspring of some great heresiarch." (*Harmonia Apost. Diss.* II. ch. ix. §. 22. See below, ch. XVIII. §. 5. p. 323, Origen's disclaimer of a *caste* of Elect, which was Valentinus's notion.) Yet he would have Augustine suffer from association with heretics! He urges that "almost all the Greek Fathers, and many of the Latins before" him were opposed to Augustine.

I maintain that, when GOD raises up a great man and replenishes him with grace and understanding to controvert a special error, and the Church fully cognizant of the error

allows his teaching, it is idle to parade the unstudied utterances of writers who were never called upon to examine the question thoroughly. The simple may be imposed upon by a muster of obscure 'authorities,' such as Ennodius and Sedulius. (Bull, *On Justification*, Pt. III. ix. §. 7.) It is disingenuous to attack 'the wretched monk' Gotteschalck for expressions substantially Augustinian, e.g. "never truly, but only sacramentally redeemed." Nor will the fact of Augustine's development of the doctrine of Grace shock by its novelty those who, with Bull, admit that the doctrine of the Resurrection was developed by Daniel in view of the trials that befell the Jewish Faith; especially when they reflect that the period of cloud and darkness that threatened the West in Augustine's time silently drew him to insist on the mysterious aspect of Revelation.

Bull asks, Whether any gain accrued to the Church from the handling of Predestination? I say reverently, Truth has its balances which in view of present excesses require adjustment from time to time. Can it be truly affirmed that the discussions on the HOLY TRINITY or on the Eucharist have proved an unmixed good?

I freely grant that the excess of Augustinianism culminated in the blasphemies afloat during the Great Rebellion; but did no blasphemy attend on the free handling of Athanasian dogma? (See Gibbon, *Decl. and Fall*, ch. XXVII.) Did not the Sacrament of the SAVIOUR'S love on a time occasion horrible combustion? Had the hard objectivity of Bull and Thorndike nothing to do with the rise of that Rational Religion, which petrified the English Church in the Georgian period? In truth, their narrow sympathies show that they possessed small power of reading the human heart, as Shakespeare and Newman have done, or of facing (with Amiel) the difficulties that weigh on the subjective mind.

But I would further ask objectors to fairly weigh the following considerations.

Is not the dogma of Election and its logical consequence Reprobation, after all, only the LORD's own parable of the sheep and the goats, read in the light of the Divine attributes of omniscience and eternity? Are we not given by Him to understand that there are distinctions of penalties in the world to come, 'few stripes' as well as 'many'? That "it is *more* blessed to give than to receive"? By His Apostle, that "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel"? that "one star differeth from another star in glory"? Therefore, that there is no such 'liberty' and 'equality' as vain demagogues preach up, hoping meanwhile to draw to themselves no small advantage? Justice and Love are the rules of Divine action; and, if we could baptize all mankind into the Faith to-morrow, in less than a week we should find accumulating proof that God's dealings with souls ante-date all provisions of Time.

The presumption in favour of insoluble mysteries gathers strength from the analogies that exist between the facts of Nature and Revelation. May not the antipathy to such mysteries be owing to the social theory of quantitative value, destructive (I conceive) to the supremacy of Spirit over Matter, which is the test of true civilization? Or may it not arise from a conscious despair of Christianity's ever resuming the male vigour of its primitive purity? That ignoble worship of numbers, that un-'divine despair' of Law and Order, which can subdue even Perikles the Olympian, 'whom all' England 'and the world worshippeth,' and yoke him in sordid splendour to the car of the incendiary Kleon; till he stands revealed "the most powerful, unscrupulous, and destructive demagogue who ever appeared in British public life." (*Goldwin Smith, 'Standard,'* June 24, 1886.)

2. Some would gladly admit a doctrine of Election which

belies its name, which retains the lights but rejects the shadows of the picture. They must logically advance to the restoration of Satan and his angels to the communion of God, and proclaim an eternal armistice between Michael and the Dragon. Some have done so with a faint "perhaps." (Amiel, *Journal Intime*, Tome I. p. 199.) What then becomes of the second Advent "to judge both the quick and dead," if we remit it into the class of supreme cataclysms, a crash of Nature only exceeding the Noachic Deluge in absolute devastation? Or, admitting a 'perhaps,' who shall warrant us against an eternal renewal of the old history, a fresh outbreak of the Powers of Evil, the darkening of the stars of heaven, as in the day when the LORD GOD charged His angels with folly? When theories are propounded, which melt down the most solemn statements of Scripture, and pretend to a clearer insight into the mind of CHRIST than that which the logical Paul or the mystic John ever acquired, Theology is undone, and Scripture becomes a corrupt text for scholiasts to re-cast at their pleasure.

The prospects of Dogmatic Theology among us are not bright. Mr. Pattison pronounces "scientific theology in the Church of England wholly extinct." (*Memoirs*, p. 314.) He even "resolved to wash" his "hands of theology, seeing that there existed in England no proper public for" it. (p. 317.) And so, perhaps, we have lost some rare enrichment of our stores of thought. Dazzled by the marvellous discoveries of physical science, men grow impatient of an imperfect science, which resting on positive revelation cannot by reason of its nature promise fresh discoveries.

To follow the old track is thought a reproach to Reason; precise terminology must make way for a glamour of rhetoric and word-painting.

In the words of one well qualified to form a correct judg-

ment, the Rulers of the English Church "seem not to be able to trust work of a less tangible kind" than "professional activity. They will get a good deal of that," Dr. Mozley tells us; "but the whole will be a fall for the English Church." (*Letters*, pp. 303, 333.) Yet it is painful to witness the decline of scientific Theology in a Church, which was once governed by S. Anselm and 'the Profound Doctor' (Bradwardine;) whose 'Subtle Doctor' (Duns Scotus) shared the empire of thought with the 'Angelic Doctor' of Italy (Aquinas;) whose 'Invincible Doctor' (Ockham) inscribed "Freedom" on her banner, and helped to light up the lamp of German intellect; whose Hooker and Bull won the admiration even of Rome.

The thought of such as these ought to inspire enthusiasm, and make the clergy feel 'We have a goodly heritage.' The old divines of the Caroline period left no successors. Humanists and political intriguers filled their thrones; vainly would they at a pinch assay to go in armour they had not proved. (1 *Sam.* xvii. 39.) They might affect the art and glitter of oratory in the pulpit or on the platform; they might even succeed in dressing up Biblical questions with a show of novelty and share their laurels with the sectaries; but for Dogmatic Theology, no! that was indeed a perilous adventure, for it led straight to a principle which awakes the hostility of those whose interest it is to keep open the divisions of Christendom: and that is, that the preaching of the pure word of God must be limited by "that which the tradition of the whole Church confineth the sense of the Scriptures to intend." (*Thorndike*, Vol. IV. Pt. II. p. 395.)

Thus it came to pass that the children of the Reformation "spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak the Jews' language." (*Nehemiah* xiii. 24.) The neglect of 'the Jews' language,' the true Theology of the Church, has

borne bitter fruit ; even the uncertain sound of the Anglican trumpet, the questioning of Creeds, the sheer inability to grasp first principles.

How many of the chief among the clergy have been hopelessly ignorant of theology, or mischievously eager to reproduce as exotic blooms the weeds of forgotten heresies ! How many, in effect, give up the belief in the Catholic Church *de jure* as well as *de facto*, and avowedly substitute a bond of aim and purpose, such as they think may connect Aristotle with Hegel, the reformation of Bhoudha with that of Luther and his fellows ! How many there be, ready to entertain the crudest novelties in doctrine and discipline, from which a faint tincture of Dogmatic Theology and, I must add, of Canon Law might have proved a preservative ! What shall we say to the 'high estate,' who 'on Divine authority' assigns '300 wives and 3000 concubines' to the hapless Solomon ? (see 1 *Kings* xi. 3,) or infers that the primitive laymen were polygamists, because their bishop (if married) was to be 'the husband of one wife,' that is, not guilty of the levity of divorce, which that most moral of heathens Marcus Tullius himself exemplified ? (Duke of S. Alban's *Speech on the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Bill*, May 24, 1886.) We must even reject this spurious lore, although it be right daintily beset with the strawberry leaves.

And, surely, I may notice with regret such an utterance as is (we will hope, incorrectly) reported of a reverend Prelate, saying "he should be prepared to go the length of taking part *in a civil war*" in view of attempts on the property of the Church. (*Church Times*, No. 1,216, p. 379.) Something may be said for Laud's policy of 'Thorough' : but the Gospel imposes limits on its professors, and Laud shrank from the military ardour of two Cardinals then in the field ;



"as a Bishop, I cannot fancy it, nor dye any robes of mine in blood." (*Works*, Vol. VII. p. 271, in a letter to the Queen of Bohemia.) Richelieu, to be sure, a Cardinal and Bishop of Luçon, besieged Rochelle in person; but he at least might plead that he fought for the *unity* of France; the Chief Shepherd however saith, "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." (*S. Matt.* xxvi. 52.)

A Church which cultivates a mere fussy activity, in competition with all the denominations, hath not that regal port, that calm dignity, which should mark Agamemnon 'the king of men.' Sentiment and Ritual no doubt appeal to a legitimate side of human nature. Even S. John is said to have worn the Jewish mitre. (*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* iii. 31.) But when we read of bishops 'in golden satin, creating quite a sensation,' we instinctively feel that the appeal lies to a lower principle than that which theological learning endeavours to satisfy. The priest's "lips must keep knowledge," ere men will "seek counsel at his mouth" (*Malachi* ii. 7.) Now whatever may be the modern practice, the Ordinal clearly witnesses to the traditional requirements of the Church. The person presented for consecration as Bishop is termed 'this *well-learned* man;' the inferior ministers are required to know 'Latin,' the language of theology in the West, of Luther and Calvin as well as of the Popes, the appropriate vehicle of exact thought, (where the more exquisite Greek is unattainable.) To what end should they know Latin, but to enable them to ballast their minds, to chasten their judgment, and to imbibe something of the serene spirit of the holy men of old? Without some such discipline their sermons must lapse into vapid exhortations; and the very reason of their existence will come to be challenged by the lay agencies.

As for thee, my Book, companion of my lonely hours, go forth once more and witness to eternal truths ; like the tiny light that told the great Mariner the secret so long guarded by the jealous Ocean. Let what is of error in thee perish as a dream when one awaketh ; what is of Truth, abide till it yield mellow fruit in fields which the LORD hath blessed. For the truths thou seekest to convey, (even if they be not partly guesses rather than truths,) are pilgrims of far-off centuries, and bear upon them the tokens of their travel ; and we, truly, see them as in a mist, having yet to reach the golden air that dwells on the heights of Sion. Tell men how that the Ideal of Divine Truth still baffles our puny efforts to master it : and, as touching thine author, bear record how he strove to traffic honestly for GOD, not as pleasing men, but seeking His approval, Whose reward is with Him, and Who satisfieth the longing soul throughout the years of eternity.

R. O.

*Holy Week, 1887.*



# PREFACE

TO

THE FIRST EDITION.

---

IN entering on an examination of Dogmatic or Positive Theology, it will be useful to premise some account of its origin and progress. In the early centuries the professors of Christianity were chiefly occupied with discursive efforts against the antagonists of the Faith, whether Jews or Pagans; and did not feel themselves called upon to consolidate the results of their religious thought in a permanent and systematic form. The Apologies for Christianity, which have come down to us, doubtless contain the germs of what it was reserved for the future to develope; but we find little attempt at a synthetical arrangement. The *Stromateis* of S. Clement of Alexandria is full of ancient erudition; but we move through a tangled wilderness of sweets, without a definite landmark. In Origen however (A.D. 230,) we recognise the first regular treatise of positive Theology. His work 'Of Principles,' *Peri Archon*, is eminently of that class: it displays genius of a high order, and a candour worthy of the imitation of all Christians. We can only regret that the writer should have indulged his imagination too freely. In the fourth century S. Augustine wrote many dogmatic treatises. Such are those 'Of True Religion,' 'Of Christian

Doctrine,' the 'Enchiridion,' and a great portion of his large work, 'Of the City of God.' In the same age Prosper of Aquitaine collected a book of 'Sentences' out of Augustine's writings, and Ruffinus of Aquileia wrote an 'Exposition' of the Creed. Subsequently we have a very brief summary 'Of Ecclesiastical Dogmas' by Gennadius of Marseilles; and a book 'Of the Faith, addressed to Peter a deacon' by Fulgentius bishop of Ruspa. In the middle of the seventh century Taïon or Tajo bishop of Saragossa reduced into five books the theological statements scattered in the writings of S. Gregory the Great. Among the Greeks John of Damascus, otherwise called Mansour, (A.D. 730,) was the first who composed a true Summary of Theology. His work 'Of the Orthodox Faith' is divided into four books. In the first, he treats of God and His attributes; in the second, of the creation and the creatures and of predestination; in the two last, of the Incarnation and the Sacraments, terminating with the resurrection of the dead. The first among the Latins, who has treated theological subjects in a scholastic form, is S. Anselm in the different treatises which he has composed. There is this difference between the *scholastic* and the positive Theology, that the latter rests solely on the Scripture and the tradition of Councils and Fathers; while the scholastic, giving itself larger room, adds the help of human reason, of philosophy and the other sciences. S. Anselm was imitated by Guillaume Des Champeaux, Peter Abelard, Anselm of Laon, and others. These last Theologians reduced their Theology into *Sentences*. It is under that title that S. Bernard cites the Theology of Abelard. Peter Lombard bishop of Paris (A.D. 1141,) improved on their plan; and reduced the sentiments of the Fathers into four books of Sentences, following the example of Damascene. And it is this method, which has been followed by most of the Schoolmen that came after him;

until S. Thomas Aquinas (who also employed it) established another order in his *Summa Theologiæ*, which the Schoolmen eventually preferred. After Aquinas the scholastic Theology degenerated greatly from its first estate; and there was seen to reign in it a vain subtlety and a low chicanery, unworthy of the gravity of Christian schools. Melchior Canus bishop of the Canaries, one of the Trent Divines, reclaimed forcibly against those abuses; but he nevertheless maintains with reason, that the scholastic Theology is not to be disregarded in consequence of these faults, which should be attributed to those paltry Theologians and not to the science itself.\* It is certain that the disgust bred by the excesses of the later Schoolmen, as well as the exigencies of the Classical Revival of the fifteenth century, have led to the gradual neglect of the study of Theology in general.<sup>b</sup> The energies of Divines since the period of the Reformation have been spent on polemical rather than dogmatic theology. The Roman side was chiefly anxious to expose the 'pestilent heresies' of Luther and Calvin; the Protestant, to demonstrate the 'enormities' of the Bishop of Rome and his adherents. But it is no slight proof of the intellectual superiority of Calvin, that, while relinquishing the theological wealth which ages had stored up in the Roman Church, he endeavoured to afford his followers compensation by bequeathing to them his 'Institutes;' that they might not be without rudder or compass in that stormy age. The task of producing a similar standard of dogma for the Lutherans was left to Chemnitz; it was executed with less success and far inferior results. In England Bishop Jewell's 'Apology' and the 'Defence' of it against Harding

\* In drawing up this sketch I have availed myself of Mabillon's admirable Treatise, 'Des Etudes Monastiques.' (Part. II. c. 6, Ed. Paris, 1692.)

<sup>b</sup> Even one of our best Divines,

Dr. Thomas Jackson, sometime President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the reign of James I., speaks in a disparaging tone of the Schools and their disputations. (Works, Tom. II. c. 25, p. 677.)

were the books which obtained somewhat of authoritative sanction from the rulers of the Church : but it is plain that they were cherished as polemical manifestoes to justify the separation from Rome, not as a summary of Christian doctrine. Since that time the Divines of the English Church have produced noble theological treatises ; but they have (with the exception of Bishop Pearson's on the Creed) been either devoted to the illustration of special subjects, or have belonged to the class of exegesis, or have been largely tinged with a polemical colour.\* In our zeal for liberty and purity, and jealousy of prejudicing the virgin soil with inherited traditions, it too often comes to pass, that, while we invite the student to examine for himself on every point, it ends with his not examining at all. Or, again, we remit him to some Patristic treatise on the Blessed TRINITY, or an elaborate argument in favour of Episcopacy, or a volume of sermons on sacramental grace ; and he is left to suppose that he has taken a full survey of the field of Theology. So far as a student has accurately examined a special department, it is of some advantage to him : but it never will atone for ignorance of the general bearings of the subject. Let him study Theology ever so extensively, he will be drawn by taste or circumstances to some special branch of it. It is vain to pretend to absolute freedom from bias ; it is wise and righteous to endeavour to check its vicious exaggeration by a knowledge of the universal as well as of particulars.

To supply the deficiency in this department adequately, would require the combination of great abilities and of profound learning. Meanwhile without hoping to realise my

\* In Hooker's Work 'Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity' the Fifth and largest book is occupied with discussions on the lawfulness of the use of the surplice, organs, the ring in marriage, &c. All this

was doubtless expedient for those times ; but that circumstance does not lessen the regret of finding so much clay mixed up with the gold and silver of the image.

own ideal, or presuming to arrogate to myself the possession of the full qualifications, I have undertaken to make an attempt in the right direction. And I may claim this merit; that the Patristic authorities, so frequently cited hereafter, have not been borrowed to sustain any preconceived theories, but are the results of independent and careful perusal.

It remains that I should explain, first, the reasons which have decided the form of the work and the order of its parts; secondly, the principles which have been kept in view in the citation of authorities. 1. It has been the plan of Anglican Divines to comment on the Apostles' or the Nicene Creeds as if they were a complete summary of Theology. Now to a certain extent this notion holds good. For they do contain the germs of all Theology. But to suppose that, because the doctrines of Grace and the Sacraments are not expressed in the Creeds, therefore they are not a portion of the original deposit of the Faith as much as those that are expressed, is (I must think) untenable. What disciple of the Reformation would be content to admit that the doctrine of Justification by Faith only was a questionable point? What admirer of the Mediæval 'Ages of Faith,' (as they have been styled) would be satisfied with silence on the subject of the Real Presence? Would the assertors of the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration bear to be told, that not to emphasize the connection of Baptism with the remission of sins was the intention of the framers of the Creed, but mainly to interdict such practices as that into which S. Cyprian fell, of re-baptizing heretics. Not that they denied the connection, for they assert it, but incidentally only. I say thus much to show, why in treating professedly of Theology I am not satisfied to be limited to the contents of the Creeds. They are admirable as standards of general Christian profession, or as solemn definitions against particular heresies, or as hymns of jubilant



Faith; but they should not be pressed to a service they were not designed for. The *Summa Theologiæ* of S. Thomas Aquinas is too vast to serve as my model, and is almost more metaphysical than theological. The Sentences of Lombard present greater facilities; but his mode of treating the 'Seven Sacraments,' and the large room occupied by the exposition of the Decalogue or Moral Theology, render the work difficult of adaptation. Damascene's work 'Of the Orthodox Faith' comes nearest my proposed mark; yet his ethical disquisitions, his attempt at an encyclopædic science, his discussions on the Adoration due to the Images and Relics of Saints (yet such as was paid to the statues and person of the living Emperor), all precluded an exact imitation. I have thus been led to treat of the common-places of Theology in an eclectic manner, though the work of Damascene has been my chief model. In the present work, the subject of the Authority of the Holy Scripture and the respect or obedience due to Tradition is made preliminary to the whole treatise. Moral Theology is entirely omitted, as being distinct from dogma. Instead of merging the Church in the consideration of the Sacraments, I have introduced the examination of its nature and character in its most abstract form as the Bride of CHRIST, immediately after the portion relating to our Incarnate LORD. Then comes an account of the doctrines of Grace in their proper order, Predestination, Election, Justification, Regeneration, Sanctification, before the treatment of the Sacraments and ordinances, which are (as Tertullian calls them) the 'clothing of Faith.' In the Schoolmen as well as Damascene the doctrines of Grace are separately treated; some in connection with the nature of Man, others as attached to the Sacraments, which (where they are valid) are "certain sure witnesses" of Grace. In Damascene there is not a word about Apostolic Succession, or the Sacrament of Order, or of

Penance (at least as viewed sacramentally). I have discussed the sacramental claims of "the five commonly called Sacraments" in a chapter on Sacraments in general; have touched on Penance under the Power of the Keys; and introduced the questions of Order, Apostolic Succession, and Episcopacy, in that of the Christian Ministry. A chapter on the Intermediate State of the departed has afforded opportunity of examining several points, which are regarded as dogma by the Greek and Latin Churches, which cannot be so treated by members of the Reformed Churches, which are found more or less developed in the Primitive Church, and which therefore cannot be passed over in silence by those who profess a regard for Antiquity. It is due as well to the memory of the ancient godly Fathers as to the liberty in which CHRIST hath made us free, as well to a decent regard for the convictions of the largest Communions (as the Greek and Latin are), as for the persuasion of religious Protestants, to examine those points with somewhat more care and patience than has generally been bestowed.

In the concluding chapter I have omitted the details about a personal Antichrist, and the particulars respecting the future Judgment; because they either belong to the province of unfulfilled Prophecy, or appear in Scripture in too parabolic a form to admit of being dogmatically treated.

2. A Theologian in the position of a Minister of the Church of England has his choice of two alternatives. He may either simply exercise his own thought on Holy Scripture without reference to the conclusions of other men, or he may avail himself of those conclusions. The first is often fallacious or may produce disastrous consequences. It is fallacious, because, after all, those who fancy they are pursuing an independent line are unconsciously swayed by the foregone conclusions and prejudices of their day or country. It some-

times produces disastrous consequences, because the history of opinion like that of civil society is being continually repeated under varying circumstances, so that the so-called independent thinker fails to learn from the experience of the past, if he neglects to study its records. Mark Pattison notes this fault in the Noëtic school at Oriel Coll. Oxford before A.D. 1827. (*Memoirs*, p. 78.) On the other hand, he may avail himself of the conclusions at which the wise and good men of past ages have arrived. And in doing so he may either limit his application to the writers of his own Communion or country, or he may extend his researches beyond them. If he chooses the former course, his work will scarcely escape the influence of a sectarian spirit. If he selects the latter, he must necessarily pause and distinguish. The vastness of such an undertaking defeats its utility. He discovers that Christendom is split up into antagonistic fragments; and present Unity is but a dream. Some will bid him take his stand on the Bible only. But he finds that all the great Christian communities agree in reverencing the Inspired Word of God as the ultimate rule of Christian Faith. How shall they have a chance of agreeing on a common interpretation, on a common dogma? Refer to the consent of Primitive Antiquity, is the advice of others. Here at last we seem to draw to a termination of our difficulties. But when we closely examine the remains of Antiquity which have come down to us, we shall find the *consent* not so uniform or such as many have been led to suppose. Some points of doctrine are treated with a boldness of speculation, which would scandalise the timidity or caution of later times; while ideas, which we are apt to regard as Mediæval, appear under the most respectable patronage. Yet, allowing for these admissions, it appears to me that we do find more of *consent* in the early ages of the

Church, than we can hope to discover in disunited Christendom. But we may ask, What is Primitive Antiquity, and how is it to be limited? I reject the notion of a peculiar veneration for the first three centuries. What are we to think of a theory, which deprives us of the example of the Catholic Church at the very juncture when she displays her mission on a large scale and under circumstances like our own? Or which would under pretence of purity deprive us of the four great Fathers of the Greek Church, Epiphanius, Basil, Nazianzen, and Chrysostom, and of the four Doctors of the Latin Church, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory? We come then to Bishop Ken's formula of 'the Church before the division of the East and West.' This has found considerable favour among us of late. But it will not bear the test of a close scrutiny. For we can hardly suppose that those who make that formula their rallying-point actually mean that they would submit to the dogma of the Church up to the moment of its formal separation into antagonistic communions. They imagine a happy period when all was tranquillity, undisturbed by the ambition of the Popes, undimmed by the gloom of the 'Dark Ages.'<sup>4</sup> But in point of fact, they would have to endorse some of the practices and tenets of the Mediæval Church, to which Protestants are uniformly and determinedly opposed.

For my part I defer with reverence to the collective voice of the Ancient Church as expressed in its Councils and

<sup>4</sup> The formal act of schism between the East and West was completed in the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine X. Monomachus. On Saturday the 6th of July, 1054, at the hour of tierce, when the Clergy were preparing to celebrate the Liturgy, the Legates deposited on the altar of S. Sophia a writing of excommunication,

wherein they accused the Greeks of a complication of heresies. (*Vid.* Labbe. *Concilia*, Tom. IX. pp. 992, 993.) Fleury candidly remarks, that these heresies were for the most part but consequences drawn from their teaching or conduct, which the Greeks disavowed. (*Histoire du Christianisme*, Liv. LX. ch. 9.)

the publicly approved writings of its Theologians, the *Fathers* (as they are called). It is the only standard, to which the Church of England (of which I am a minister) seems to profess an adherence in her authorised formularies. And, without pretending to a rigid limitation, I in general cite the writers within the period of the Four General Councils; because (with the exception of S. Gregory the Great's writings) all the important documents of the Church belong to that period. The social calamities, which attended the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West, disturbed the active interchange of ideas in the Church; and the Bishops and Pastors directed their energies to the practical duties which demanded their undivided attention. S. Gregory draws a pathetic picture of the state of Italy in his time; he deplors the depopulation of cities, the burning of churches, the destruction of monasteries, the farms left without a cultivator; and adds, significantly, "What is going on in other parts of the world I know not. For in this country, in which we live, the world no longer announces but exhibits its end."\* One of his successors, Pope Agatho, writing to the Sixth General Council (A.D. 680), looks back to a brighter Past. "How," he asks, "can the knowledge of the Scriptures be found to the full among men dwelling in the midst of barbarians and deriving their support from bodily toil with great anxiety, were it not that in simplicity of heart we preserve the faith delivered by our fathers and canonically defined by our holy predecessors and by the Five Synods; praying and earnestly maintaining one thing principally, that the canonical decisions be neither changed nor added to, but preserved uninjured both in expression and meaning."† Practically then I confine the appeal to the undivided Church, to the first five centuries.

\* S. Greg. Magn. P.P. I. Dialogg. L. iii. c. 38. p. 310.

† Labbe, Tom. VI. p. 633.

Later writers, Mediæval, Roman, and Protestant, are freely employed ; but for the sake of illustration, or for historical reasons, or because I adopt their language, not as exhibiting the consent of the Catholic Church. Where I have followed a single Father, (as has been the case chiefly in the chapters on Grace), I have not done so without precedent. The Articles of the Church of England bear me out in deferring to the teaching of S. Augustine. To cite the testimony of another class, it is thus that the thoroughly learned Benedictine, Mabillon, advises students in theology. "The best rule that one can observe in the choice of Fathers is, to prefer those whom God hath singularly applied to clear up particular questions, rather than those who have only treated them incidentally, and at a time when the matter had not yet been agitated nor decided by the Church ; and at the same time to prefer the works of a Father which treat of a particular point, to certain passages where the same Father has but spoken of it in passing. It is by this rule that the Church hath always preferred S. Augustine to all the other Fathers on the subject of Grace, that is to say, the works which he has composed against the Pelagians." <sup>s</sup> And in the very year in which the Third General Council was held at Ephesus (A.D. 431,) Pope S. Coelestine, being consulted by the Gallican bishops about Augustine's doctrine, writes in reply : "Augustine, a man of holy memory for his life and merits, we have ever had in our communion ; nor hath even the rumour of sinister suspicion ever aspersed him, whom we remember to have been long ago esteemed among the best Doctors by my predecessors. All therefore in common thought well of him, as one who certainly was to all an object of love and respect." <sup>h</sup>

<sup>s</sup> Des Etudes Monastiques, Part. ii. ch. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Coelestinus P.P. I. Epist. I.

ad Episcopos Galliæ ; *apud* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1612.

In conclusion; I will only briefly notice the objections brought in *limine* against the Fathers, particularly the writers of the fourth century whom I have most frequently cited. No one can state them more trenchantly than M. Bunsen. "The fourth century," he writes, "or the Constantinian and Theodosian Church, began to formulize the Christian faith with both these imperfections." That is, 'the doctrinal expressions being raised into tests of Churchmanship, and Imperial despotism being made the means of enforcing them.' "The seventh century presented the complete system of a Christology which was without the historical CHRIST, and of a Pneumatology which was without the SPIRIT. The climax of the profound confusion into which the human mind was thrown by the combined power of one-sided and unmethodical speculation, of hierarchical intrigue and of Byzantine Imperialism, is exhibited in the so-called Athanasian Creed."<sup>1</sup> Further on, he says that "the antagonism between the Reformation and the mediæval Church is irreconcilable," and that it "exists in respect of the early Greek as well as the mediæval Latin Church; the inmost principles of these Churches make it inevitable."<sup>2</sup> The antagonism is instanced in the totally opposite views of the Priesthood as an office of mediation and of government, and of Justification by Faith only. Now the object of the present work is not controversy; and if, after a conscientious perusal of the documents of the early centuries, M. Bunsen is content to sum up his results in such sweeping censure as the above sentence indicates, I will only express a temperate regret. Something may be allowed to his argument. The Lutheran doctrine of Justi-

<sup>1</sup> Outlines of the Philosophy of Language and Religion, Vol. II. p. 262. London, 1854.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 274.

fication by Faith *only* was, doubtless, not taught by the Fathers ; but their lives in general afforded the best evidence of a real Faith. The mediation and authority of the Priesthood was sometimes, it may be, over-rated : but it must be remembered that the sanctity and prudence of the Priestly governors of the Church in the decline of the Roman Empire gave a reality to those claims which cannot be overlooked.<sup>k</sup> I have not attempted to exhibit the statements of the Fathers, as if they were a chain of infallible truths, but as specimens of an induction of the highest moral probability. The disciples of the old Theology are not likely to forsake their cherished principles for the sake of bare conjectures and brilliant but not new declamation. Milton could ask ‘the clients of Antiquity,’ “Whether, think ye, would she approve still to doat upon immeasurable, innumerable, and therefore unnecessary and unmerciful volumes, choosing rather to err with the specious name of the Fathers, or to take a sound truth at the hand of a plain upright man, that all his days hath been diligently reading the holy Scriptures, and thereto imploring God’s grace, while the admirers of Antiquity have been beating their brains about their ambones, their diptychs, and meniaias?”<sup>l</sup> They might rhetorically reply, (it would be an answer in the same strain,) “Hath long time so confounded heaven and earth, that Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Bucer, Beza, do see : and Hilarie, Gregorie, Ambrose, Hierom, Chrysostom, and the rest, are blind?”<sup>m</sup> I prefer calling attention to the detailed vindication of the Fathers by the late Professor Blunt, who attributes the systematic depreciation

<sup>k</sup> See M. Guizot’s sketch of Gallic ecclesiastical life, *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*, Vol. I.

<sup>l</sup> Of Reformation in England, Book I. *circa. finem*. Prose Works,

Vol. I. p. 26, Ed. London, 1806.

<sup>m</sup> An Apologie of the English Seminaries of Rome and Rhemes, by Cardinal Allen, printed at Mounts [Mons], in Henault, 1581.



of them to the influence of Daillé and Barbeyrac; "I well remember," he says, "that all the early years of my life my impression of these authors was that which Daillé had given me, as almost all the labours of my later years have tended to efface it."<sup>a</sup>

R. O.

A.D. 1858.

<sup>a</sup> Blunt's *Lectures on the Study of the Early Fathers*, p. 24. London, 1857.

# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
OF FAITH AND THEOLOGY . . . . .	1

## CHAPTER II.

OF SCRIPTURE THE RULE OF FAITH . . . . .	11
--	----

## CHAPTER III.

✓ OF CATHOLIC TRADITION AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH	28
---	----

## CHAPTER IV.

OF THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD . . . . .	68
--	----

## CHAPTER V.

OF THE HOLY TRINITY. . . . .	107
------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER VI.

OF THE LOGOS OR WORD OF GOD; OF HIS ETERNAL GENERATION, AND CONSUBSTANTIALITY WITH THE FATHER . . . . .	132
--	-----

## CHAPTER VII.

OF THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST, AND OF HIS PROCESSION	157
	h

## CHAPTER VIII.

	PAGE
OF THE HOLY ANGELS . . . . .	177

## CHAPTER IX.

OF SATAN AND THE FALLEN ANGELS . . . . .	190
--	-----

## CHAPTER X.

OF THE CREATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD . . . . .	198
---	-----

## CHAPTER XI.

OF THE CREATION OF MAN . . . . .	216
----------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XII.

OF PARADISE, OF THE FALL OF MAN, AND OF ORIGINAL SIN . . . . .	230
--	-----

## CHAPTER XIII.

OF THE PREPARATION FOR THE COMING OF CHRIST BY THE LAW OF NATURE AND THE LAW OF MOSES . . . . .	246
--	-----

## CHAPTER XIV.

OF THE INCARNATION OF THE WORD OR SON OF GOD . . . . .	259
--	-----

## CHAPTER XV.

OF THE PASSION AND ATONEMENT OF CHRIST . . . . .	274
--	-----

## CHAPTER XVI.

OF CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL, OF HIS RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION . . . . .	289
---	-----

## CHAPTER XVII.

OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH . . . . .	295
----------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XVIII.

OF PREDESTINATION . . . . .	320
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTE XIX.

OF ELECTION . . . . .	PAGE 338
-----------------------	-------------

CHAPTER XX.

OF JUSTIFICATION, AND OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION . . .	350
---	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

OF SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS . . . . .	368
--	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

OF GRACE AND FREE WILL . . . . .	376
----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL . . . . .	383
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXIV.

OF BAPTISM . . . . .	398
----------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXV.

OF CONFIRMATION . . . . .	407
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXVI.

OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST . . . . .	413
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXVII.

OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE . . . . .	430
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVIII.

OF THE POWER OF THE KEYS . . . . .	442
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXIX.

OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY AND HIERARCHY . . . . .	449
---	-----

## CHAPTER XXX.

	PAGE
OF THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS	458

## CHAPTER XXXI.

OF THE RESURRECTION AND THE FUTURE STATE	488
--	-----

GENERAL INDEX	499
---------------	-----

# LIST OF AUTHORS

CITED IN THE FOLLOWING VOLUME.



- ALENSIS, ALEXANDER, *Summa Theologiæ*, ed. Colon. Agripp., 1622.  
ALEXANDER, NATALIS, *Hist. Eccles.* ed. Paris., 1699.  
AMBROSIUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Bened.  
AQUINAS, S. THOMAS, *Summa Theologiæ*, *Opp.* ed. Antwerp., 1612.  
ARNOBIUS, *Adversus Gentes.* ed. Hamburgi, 1610.  
ARNOLDUS DE BONA VALLE, *De Verbis Domini in cruce, ad calc.* *Opp.* S. Cypriani, q. v.  
ATHANASIUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1627.  
AUGUSTINUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Bened.  
  
BALSAMON, THEODORUS, *ap.* Bevereg. q. v.  
BANNES, DOMINICUS, *In Secundam Secundæ S. Tho. Aquin.* ed. Duaci, 1615.  
BARNESIUS, JOANNES, O. S. B., *Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, ap.* Brown. Fascicul. Rerum, q. v.  
BASILIUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Paris, 1618.  
BELLARMINUS, ROBERTUS, S. R. E. Cardinalis, *Disputationes*, ed. Colon. Agripp., 1628.  
BERNARDUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1551.  
BEVEREGIUS, GUILIELMUS, *Episc. Asaphensis, Synodicon sive Pandectæ Canonum*, ed. Oxon., 1672.  
BOETHIUS, *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, ed. Antverpiæ, 1607.  
BRADWARDINUS, THOMAS, *Archiep. Cantuar., De Causa Dei contra Pelagianos*, ed. Savil. Londini, 1618.  
BRAMHALL, JOHN, *Abp. of Armagh, Works*, ed. Oxford, 1842.  
BROWN, EDVARDUS, *Fasciculus Rerum expetendarum, &c.*, ed. Londini, 1690.  
BURNET, GILBERT, *Bp. of Sarum, Letters from Italy*, ed. Rotterdam, 1686.  
  
CALVINUS, JOANNES, *Opp.* ed. Genevæ, 1618.  
CANUS, MELCHIOR, *Episc. Canariensis, Loci Theologici*, ed. Colonia, 1585.  
CAROLINI Libri adv. *Imagines Auctor*, ed. 1549.  
CASSANDER, GEORGIUS, *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1616.  
CAVE, GUILIELMUS, *Historia Literaria*, ed. Londini, 1688.

- CEDRENIUS, GEORGIUS, *Historiarum Compendium*, ed. Paris., 1647.  
 CHAMIERUS, DANIEL, *Panstratia Catholica*, ed. Genevæ, 1626.  
 CHEMNITIVS, MARTINUS, *Loci Theologici*, ed. Witebergæ, 1623.  
 CHRYSTOSTOMUS, S. JOANNES, *Opp.* ed. Savil. Etonæ, 1612.  
 CLARA, FRANCISCUS à S., *Deus, Natura, Gratia*, ed. Lugduni, 1635.  
 CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Heinsii, Lugduni Batavorum, 1616.  
 CLEMENS ROMANUS, S., *Recognitiones*, *apud* Cotelieri Patres Apostolicos, ed. Antverpiæ, 1700.  
*Concilia*, ed. Labbei et Cossartii, Paris., 1671.  
*Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae*, ed. Wilkins, Londini, 1737.  
 CONTARENIUS, GASPAR, S. R. E. Cardinalis, *Opp. fol.* ed. Paris., 1571.  
*Corpus Juris Canonici*, ed. Coloniae Munatiana, 1670.  
 COSIN, JOHN, *Bp. of Durham, Scholastical History of the Canon of the Scripture*, ed. London, 1657.  
 CYPRIANUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Fell. Oxon., 1682.  
 CYRILLUS, HIEROSOLYMITANUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Oxon., 1703.  
  
 DAMASCENUS, S. JOANNES, *De Orthodoxa Fide*, ed. Veronæ, 1531.  
 DIDYMUS, ALEXANDRINUS, *De Spiritu Sancto*, *ap.* S. Hieronymi *Opp.* q. v.  
 DIONYSIVS AREOPAGITA, (Pseudo-), *De Cœlesti Hierarchia*, ed. Paris., 1615.  
 DURANDUS à S. PORCIANO, *Episc. Meldensis*, *In Sententias Libri*, ed. Lugduni, 1622.  
  
 EPIPHANIUS, S., *Opp.*, ed. Paris., 1622.  
 ERIGENA; *vide* Jo. *Scotus*.  
 ESTIVS, GUILIELMUS, *In Sententias Commentarii*, ed. Duaci, 1615.  
 ETHERIVS UXAMENSIS *Episc.*, *ap.* *Bibl. Max. Patrum*, q. v.  
 EUSEBIUS PAMPHILI, *Episc. Casareae Palæstinae*, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Valesii, Paris., 1659.  
 ———, *Præparatio Evangelica*, ed. Paris., 1628.  
  
 FABRICIVS, JOAN. ALBERT., *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, ed. Hamburgi, 1703.  
 FLEURY, *Histoire du Christianisme*, ed. Paris, 1836.  
 FORBESIVS, GUILIELMUS, *Episc. Edinburgensis*, *Considerationes Modestæ*, ed. Londini, 1658.  
  
 GENNADIUS MASSILIENSIS, *De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, *ap.* S. Aug. *Opp.* q. v.  
 GERSONIVS, JOANNES, *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1606.  
 GRATIANUS, *Decretum sive Concordantia Discordantium Canonum*, *ap.* *Corpus Juris Canonici*. q. v.  
 GREGORIUS MAGNUS P.P. I., S., *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1619.  
 ———, *Epistolæ*, *ap.* Labbei *Concilia*, q. v.  
 GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1609.  
 GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1615.  
 GUILLERMUS PARISIENSIS *Episc.*, *Opp.* ed. Paris., 1516.  
  
 HIERONYMUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Antverpiæ, 1579.  
 HILARIUS, S., *Opp.* ed. Basileæ, 1570.

- HIPPOLYTUS, S.**, *De Antichristo*, ed. Paris., 1661.  
**HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS**, *De Prædestinatione Dialogus*, *ap.* Cassandri Opp. q. v.  
**HOOKE, RICHARD**, *Works*, ed. Keble, Oxford, 1841.  
**HUESTIUS, PETRUS DANIEL** Episc. Abrincensis, *Alnetanæ Quæstiones*, ed. Lipsiæ, 1692.  
  
**IRENÆUS, S.**, Opp. ed. Colon. Agripp., 1596.  
**ISIDORUS HISPALENSIS** Episc., S., Opp. ed. Col. Agripp. 1617.  
**ISIDORUS PELUSIOTA, S.**, Opp. ed. Neostadii, 1605.  
  
**JACKSON, THOMAS, D.D.**, President of C. C. C. Oxford, *Works*, ed. London, 1673.  
**JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS**, Opp. ed. Hudson. Oxon., 1720.  
**JUSTINUS MARTYR, S.**, Opp. ed. Paris., 1615.  
  
**LABBE, PHILIPPE**, et **GABRIEL COSSART, S. J.**; *Vide Concilia*.  
**LANCELOTTUS, JOANNES PAULUS, J. C.** Perusinus, *Institutiones Juris Canonici*, *ap.* Corpus Juris Canonici, q. v.  
**LEO MAGNUS, S.**, P.P. I., *ap.* Labbei Concilia, q. v.  
**LIBERATUS, Archidiaconus** Carthaginensis, *Breviarium*, ed. Paris., 1675.  
**LIMBORCH, PHILIPPUS à**, *Theologia Christiana*, ed. Amstæledami, 1686.  
**LOMBARDUS, PETRUS**, Episc. Paris., *Sententiæ*, ed. Col. Agrippinæ, 1609.  
  
**MABILLON, DOM JEAN, O. S. B.**, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, ed. Paris, 1703—1713.  
 ———, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, ed. Paris., 1685.  
 ———, *Museum Italicum*, ed. Paris., 1687.  
**MACARIUS ÆGYPTIUS, S.**, *Homiliæ*, ed. Francofurti, 1594.  
**MAIMONIDES, Rabbi MOSES**, *More Nevochim*, ed. Buxtorfii, Basileæ, 1629.  
**MAXIMUS, S.**, *Scholia in S. Dionysium Areopagitam*, q. v.  
**METHODIUS, S.**, *Convivium Decem Virginum*, *ap.* Auctarium Novissimum Biblioth. PP., ed. Combefis., Paris., 1672.  
**MOORE, HENRY, D.D.**, *Philosophical Works*, ed. London, 1662.  
  
**CECUMENIUS** *Comment. in Nov. Testamentum*, ed. Paris., 1631.  
**OPTATUS, S.**, Milevitanus Episc., Opp. ed. Paris., 1631.  
**ORIGENES** *Contra Celsum*, ed. Augustæ Vindelicorum, 1605.  
 ———, *Dialogus contra Marcionitas*, ed. Wetstenii, Basil., 1674.  
 ———, *Peri Archon*, inter Opp. ed. Paris., 1619.  
  
**PACIANUS, S.**, Barcinonensis Episc., *Tractatus*, *ap.* Biblioth. Max. Patrum, q. v.  
**PANORMITANUS, NICOLAUS DE TUDESCHIS, S. R. E. Cardinalis**, Opp. ed. Lugduni, 1586.  
**PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, Abbas Corbeiensis**, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, ed. Colon. Agripp., 1550.  
**Patres Apostolici**, ed. Hefele, Tübingæ, 1842.  
**Patres**: *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, ed. Lugduni, 1677.



PETAVIUS, DIONYSIUS, à Soc. Jesu, Dogmata Theologica, ed. Antwerp., 1700.

PHILO JUDÆUS, Opp. ed. Mangey, Londini, 1742.

PLATO, Opp. ed. Bekker, Londini, 1826.

PLINIUS, C., SECUNDUS, Naturalis Historia, ed. Basileæ, 1530.

PROSPER AQUITANUS, Responsiones, *ap.* S. Aug. Opp. q. v.

Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos, *ap.* S. Justini M. Opp. q. v.

Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, ed. Londini, 1571.

RENAUDOT, EUSEBIUS, Liturgiæ Orientales, ed. Paris., 1716.

RUFFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, Historia Eccles., ed. Basileæ, 1523.

RUPERTUS, Abbas Tuicensis, De Victoria Verbi Dei, ed. Noremburgæ, 1525.

SCHARPII Cursus Theologicus, ed. Genevæ, 1620.

SCOTUS, JOHANNES DUNS, Opp. ed. Antverpiæ, 1620.

—— ERIGENA, JOANNES, De Divisione Naturæ, ed. Gale, Oxon., 1681.

SGUROPULUS, SILVESTER, Historia Concilii Florentini, ed. Creighton, Hagæ Comit., 1660.

SOCRATES, Hist. Eccles., ed. Valesii, Paris., 1668.

TATIANUS ASSYRIUS, Contra Græcos, *ap.* S. Justini M. Opp. q. v.

TERTULLIANUS, Opp. ed. Paris., 1664.

THEODORETUS, Episc. Cyri, Opp. ed. Sirmond. Paris., 1642.

——, Hist. Eccles., ed. Valesii, Paris., 1673.

THEODORUS MOPSUESTENUS Episc., Fragmenta, *ap.* Labbei Concilia, q. v.

THEODOTUS BYZANTINUS, Epitomæ, *ap.* S. Clem. Alex. Opp. q. v.

THEOPHILUS, S. ANTIOCHENUS Episc. *ap.* S. Justini M. Opp. q. v.

THORNDIKE, HERBERT, Works, ed. Oxford, 1844.

VALENTIA, GREGORIUS DE, à Soc. Jesu, Commentarii Theologici, ed. Lugduni, 1619.

VASQUEZ, GABRIEL, à Soc. Jesu, In D. Thom. Commentarii, ed. Venetiis, 1600.

VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS, Commonitorium, ed. Baluzii, Paris., 1684.

ZONARAS, JOANNES, *ap.* Bevereg. q. v.

# A TREATISE OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### OF FAITH AND THEOLOGY.

§. 1. ALL Christian Theology is founded primarily on Faith. Of Faith.  
Nor is it possible to exclude Reason from any definition of Faith, which seeks to embrace its main elements. For, seeing that Reason is defined to be “a faculty of the human mind whereby it endeavours to know truth either by ratiocination or by simple perception,”<sup>a</sup> and Faith is described by no mean Theologian among the Ancients as “a conception of things invisible in harmony with nature,”<sup>b</sup> it would be a violation of the first laws of our nature to assert Faith to be a voluntary assent of the mind to any proposition that shall directly contradict Reason. “Without faith it is impossible to please GOD;”<sup>c</sup> and, as Reason is His special and distinguishing gift to Man in the ordinary course of His Providence, so the Faith which is acceptable to Him must be in accordance with that antecedent and primary knowledge supplied to Man by Reason. They, who out of pretended zeal for Revelation seek to disparage Natural Religion, may be justly suspected. S. Paul assumes the existence of GOD as demonstrable by Reason to the Greeks; and we should not disregard the conclusions of Reason, as to some positions being supreme probabilities amounting even to moral

<sup>a</sup> Huet. *Alnet. Quæstiones*, p. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Heb. xi. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Theodoret. *Opp. T. iv. p. 479.*

certainities, which Revelation asserts, and Faith believes, to be positive Truths. Revelation cannot go against the clear evidence of Reason; for, even when it is originally given, it presupposes evidence of its proceeding from God and of its not being an illusion of the senses. We cannot admit that a thing that comes from God should render our faculties useless. Yet an induction of Reason founded merely on the physical laws of Nature cannot avail to disprove a miracle or a mystery; for the ordinary course of Nature may be changed or suspended by God its Maker (Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*, IV. c. 18). The alliance of Faith and Reason is perpetually celebrated by a long line of Theologians and Writers on Christian Evidences as the basis of their operations, when they set about the exposition of Revealed Religion. Men are invited to repose their trust in the Invisible and Unknown God, because they already have the experience of ordinary life that such faith is at the same time reasonable and profitable.<sup>4</sup> The uncertain issues of the future interpose no effectual obstruction to the fulfilment of the common occupations of society; and therefore *à fortiori* men should not decline obedience to the revealed Will of God, because of the seeming venture which it involves.

The  
Alliance of  
Faith and  
Reason.

§. 2. But this assent to the Revealed Will of GOD necessarily presupposes those primary notions or intuitions, which generally obtain among rational beings, touching the existence of One Almighty Self-subsistent First Cause, the Maker and Preserver of all things. I say 'generally,' for polytheistic systems betray their origin in confused apprehension of what were poetic conceptions of the Unseen GOD. If some Australian or African tribes at present can form no conception of a GOD, it is a proof of a lowest stage of degradation, none against their ancestors' possession of the same. The Veddahs of Ceylon were supposed to have lost even articulate speech. Subsequent investigation has corrected that impression. On the other hand, what sublime ideas have been traditionally cherished among races most remote from modern civilization! A tribe on the Amazon believes the stars to

<sup>4</sup> Origen. adv. Celsum, p. 11. S. Joan. Damascen De Orthodoxa Fide, cap. 98.

be rays of light from the face of the Creator-Spirit." The Popol-Vuh prays for light and harvests to the One Power, whose symbols were the lightning-flash, the thunderbolt, and the hurricane. Whether such notions be innate in the human mind antecedently to instruction, or acquired (as most ideas are) by experience, by logical induction, or by the universal consent and tradition of mankind, may be disputed; but it is generally admitted that there are implanted in human nature such principles, as that Man may by them arrive at a knowledge of God with the help of the reasoning faculty natural to him.\* The two chief sources of those notions concerning the existence of God are to be found in the consciousness of the reasoning being, first with respect to external objects, and secondly with respect to himself. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead."† "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."‡

And again, the voice of conscience witnesses to a universal moral Law, which can only proceed from a higher and all-pervading Power. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."§ Some preliminary knowledge of God, however acquired, must precede Faith; "for he that cometh to God must believe that He is;"¶ and that knowledge must be in accordance with right Reason. For "whereas Belief is a kind of assent, and no one can

\* Limborch. Theol. Christ. L. i.

c ii. §. 13.

† Rom. i. 19, 20.

‡ Ps. xix. 1—3.

§ Rom ii. 14, 15.

¶ Heb. xi. 6.

assent unless to that which appears true, therefore that which is believed must needs appear to reason to be true either by itself or by reason of something intermediate: and if we trace backwards, we must needs come at last to some ultimate term, which appears to reason to be true in itself and according to itself. Therefore Faith doth not exclude Reason, but supposes previous though not *demonstrative* Reason. Whence our SAVIOUR Himself reduced the doctrine of the Faith which He preached to certain things apparent in themselves, to wit, miracles; that from things apparent and seen Reason might assent to sayings that were not apparent. After He had said, 'I and My FATHER are one,'<sup>j</sup> (which is not apparent in itself), He said, 'If I do not the works of My FATHER, believe Me not; but if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works; that ye may know, and believe, that the FATHER is in Me, and I in Him.'<sup>k</sup> And it was the same with the doctrine of the Apostles, of which it is said: "And they went forth and preached everywhere, the LORD working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."<sup>l</sup>

Demonstration necessitates the intellect to assent;<sup>m</sup> and therefore it is evident that reason of so explicit and cogent a character doth not enter into the account of Faith, which is an assent to propositions that involve the possibility of dissent. That Reason may prepare the way for Faith may readily be admitted; but that Reason is the cause of Faith can no ways be allowed. When once we have accepted mysteries on credible proofs, all we can do is to parry objections to what we cannot fully comprehend. The language of S. Dionysius of Alexandria touching the mysteries of the Apocalypse may be equally applied to all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel; he measured not, nor judged them by his own reasoning, but assigned more to faith.<sup>n</sup>

§. 3. Having now presupposed the exercise of that Reason, whereby men "believe that GOD is," we come to inquire into the formal cause of Faith; which is none other than Divine

Divine Authority the cause of Faith.

<sup>j</sup> S. John x. 30.

<sup>k</sup> *Ib.* v. 37, 38.

<sup>l</sup> S. Mark xvi. 20.—Durand. a

S. Porciano, in Lib. 3 Sent. Dist. 24, qu. 3, §. 9.

<sup>m</sup> *Id.* p. 10.

<sup>n</sup> See Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii. 25.

Authority directing the Church and revealing the Scripture.<sup>o</sup> Or "a stable assent unto things ineident, upon authority of a Divine Revealer." (Sir Thomas Browne, *Of Vulgar Errors*, Bk. vii., c. 18, p. 411.) S. Paul saith, "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of GOD."<sup>p</sup> Faith cometh by hearing or the ministry of the Church; and the hearing is that of the message which the Church is commissioned to unfold respecting the Will of GOD. This *message* is assumed by universal Christendom to be contained in what are termed the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament. We believe that the Scriptures were inspired and revealed by GOD, because the Church directed by the HOLY SPIRIT hath approved of them. Many heretical sects in the early ages admitted and circulated writings purporting to be Divine Revelations, which the Catholic Church utterly rejected. Whence S. Augustine saith, "I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me."<sup>q</sup> He did not mean thereby to exalt the authority of the existing Church above that of the Canonical Scriptures, but that it was primarily owing to the authority of the Catholic Church that he believed the Scriptures; and, therefore, when urged to receive strange documents such as the Epistle of Manichæus as a revelation from GOD, he declined to do so, because they lacked the prescription of the Catholic Church.

But the authority of the Church's testimony to the authenticity of Scripture would vanish, if the Church had the power of putting forth fresh documents from time to time, purporting to be exemplars of the Divine Will; for she would be doing precisely what Augustine blamed the Manichees for doing. Therefore we must trace the prescription as an inheritance derived from the primary authority of the original

<sup>o</sup> Durand. in Lib. 3 Sent. Dist. 24, qu. 1, §. 16.

<sup>p</sup> Rom. x. 14—17.

<sup>q</sup> S. Aug. Contra Epist. Manichæi. T. VIII. p. 154.

depositories of the Written Word of God. "What has been said of the approbation of Scripture through the Church is understood solely of the Church which was in the time of the Apostles, who were filled with the HOLY GHOST, and saw the miracles of CHRIST, and heard His teaching; and on this account were fitting witnesses of all things which CHRIST did or taught, that through their testimony the Scripture containing His doings and sayings might be approved. And so S. John saith, 'That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, declare we unto you.'"<sup>r</sup> Whence the Gospels which through that Church were approved cannot now be rejected, because there is not a similar reason in reserve; yea, he that holds the contrary is a heretic, of whatsoever condition he be."<sup>s</sup> S. Paul saith moreover, "We having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak; knowing that He which raised up the LORD JESUS shall raise us up also by JESUS, and shall present us with you."<sup>t</sup>

This then is Catholic Faith, or *historical* (as some moderns have been pleased to style it), in its intellectual signification, and as distinguished from its moral application, wherein S. Paul writes that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness;"<sup>u</sup> and, in conclusion, I define it with Durandus to be "a habit whereby we assent to the words of Scripture on account of the authority of God who reveals it."<sup>v</sup>

True Revelation positive.

§. 4. A deep thinker, to whom the development of Intellect is the highest type of civilization, and who laments over the triumph of the Catholic Church in the fourth century, (Pattison, *Memoirs*, p. 96), as "the ruin of Hellenic civilization," describes "all religions as efforts of the human spirit to come to an understanding with that Unseen Power whose pressure it feels, but whose motives are a riddle." (*Ibid.* p. 328.) This fairly depicts the questionings of minds reared in natural religion. "Feeble, ignorant, I would fathom these

<sup>r</sup> 1 S. John i. 1, 3.

<sup>s</sup> Durand. *ubi supra*, §. 9.

<sup>t</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 13, 14.

<sup>u</sup> Rom. x. 10.—See Bp. William Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, p. 1.

<sup>v</sup> 3 Sent. Dist. 24, qu. 1, §. 5.

mysteries," says Dirghatamas in the Rig-Veda; "I am troubled, and go fettered in my thought." But the Law and the Gospel came before men, not evolved out of their thinking, but as objective messages from the Unseen, ushered in by miracles, and speaking to the heart as well as the intellect of Man by living examples of wisdom and holiness such as the world had never seen. Him, whom the Athenians ignorantly groped after, S. Paul 'declared' as a witness accredited by the Unknown. He did not, as Sokrates, elicit His recognition by a process of painfully granted logical admissions. Eunapius the humanist might lament over the "chaotic darkness that should soon bear sway over the fairest regions of the earth;" but he affords us proof of the childish jugglery, to which his Hellenic sages were reduced. While the emperor Julian's sacrifice of a goose and forced institutions of charity prove to us the poverty of the Hellenic 'wisdom' and its utter indifference to human misery. Gibbon sees in its representative man Libanius but "a dreaming pedant, with his elbow on his desk;" (*Decline and Fall*, ch. xxiv.) in its efforts, "the last struggles of superstition and despair;" (ch. xxviii.) in its teaching, a labour "to corrupt the human understanding" (ch. xiii.).

§. 5. But while we acknowledge that Faith is based on Divine Authority revealed in Canonical Scripture and witnessed to by the Catholic Church, and hesitate not to confess with S. Augustine that "nothing is more wholesomely done in the Catholic Church than that Authority should precede Reason;"<sup>\*</sup> we do not reject the service of Reason in reviewing, examining, and expounding the principles of Faith. Rather we are enjoined by the Apostles to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us with meekness and fear;"<sup>x</sup> to "prove all things, hold fast that which is good;"<sup>y</sup> and to "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world."<sup>z</sup> Granting that Faith is a firm apprehension of propositions set

Reason subsequent as well as antecedent to Faith.

<sup>\*</sup> S. Aug. De Moribus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, L. i. §. 47. Tom. I. p. 704.

<sup>x</sup> 1 S. Pet. iii. 15.  
<sup>y</sup> 1 Thess. v. 21.  
<sup>z</sup> 1 S. John iv. 1.



forth by Authority such as Reason willingly submits to, "Knowledge is a secure and stable demonstration of those things which have been accepted through Faith."<sup>a</sup> "He that hath sought a reason of what he hath believed and accepted, being bound by certain chains of Reason itself, can never be plucked asunder from that which he hath believed."<sup>b</sup> This reasoned Knowledge of the principles of Faith we term *Theology*, because analytically and ultimately it is concerned with such contemplation of the Divine Nature as is compatible with Revelation.

I am aware that some have denied that Theology is speculative as well as practical in its character,<sup>c</sup> and it may be granted that synthetically and immediately (as we are chiefly concerned with it) it is more practical than speculative; yet the contemplation of the Divine Nature lies at the root of all practical Religion. "This is life eternal," saith Our LORD, "that they might know Thee the only true GOD, and JESUS CHRIST, whom Thou hast sent."<sup>d</sup> Faith and Theology have the same object; with this difference, that what Faith delivers by Authority alone, Theology delivers by Reason.<sup>e</sup>

Theology then may be defined, first, as "a habit whereby Faith and those things which are delivered in Holy Scripture are defended and declared from certain principles more known to us. And so Augustine takes it; <sup>f</sup> for he saith that 'to this science only is attributed that whereby the most wholesome Faith is begotten, nourished, defended, strengthened; in which knowledge very many of the Faithful do not excel, however they may excel in the Faith itself. For it is one thing to know only what a man ought to believe for the sake of obtaining life eternal; but another to know how this very thing may benefit the pious, and be defended against the impious, which the Apostle seems to style by its proper term *knowledge*.'"<sup>g</sup>

Secondly, it may be defined as "a habit of those things

<sup>a</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. L. vii. p. 526.

<sup>b</sup> Recogn. S. Clementis, *ap.* Cotelerii Patres Apostolicos, T. I. p. 518

<sup>c</sup> See Limborch, Theol. Christiana, cap. 1.

<sup>d</sup> S. John xvii. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Durand. in Prol. Sent. qu. 1, §. 10.

<sup>f</sup> De Trinitate, L. xiv. c. 1. T. VIII. p. 948.

<sup>g</sup> Durand. *ubi supra*, §. 7.

which are deduced from the articles of the Faith and from the words of Holy Scripture as conclusions from principles.”<sup>b</sup> Melchior Canus adopts this, saying that “Faith and Theology are not related otherwise than as the holding of principles and the knowledge of conclusions.”<sup>1</sup> But Durandus demurs, and admitting that Theology is more commonly so taken doubts whether it be the more truly so defined. For such conclusions are really to be regarded more as illustrations brought forward to clear the meaning of the articles of Faith than as deductions from the articles themselves. Thus, for example, we say that the distinction of the Divine Persons in the TRINITY is relative and not absolute, that we may sustain as far as may be an article so obscure to human reason as that of the TRINITY. For if the distinction were absolute, it would necessarily follow that it was effected through the Divine Essence, and then the Divine Essence itself would be pluralified, which is impossible; or through something absolute, added to the Essence, and then there would be true and real composition in GOD, which again is impossible. Again, we say that the SON of GOD had real flesh and not fantastic, to declare how the article should be understood which lays down that the SON of GOD is Man, to wit, that HE is *very* Man and not in appearance only. Hence it will appear, that Theology, taken for a habit whereby such things are deduced, is not properly a science; because demonstrative reasoning, which alone properly constitutes science, proceeds from propositions necessary and known *per se* or reducible to things known *per se*; but such reasoning is foreign to the doctrines of Faith, for to argue from Authority is most proper to principles obtained through Divine Revelation.

S. Thomas Aquinas indeed decides in the affirmative, that Theology is a science.<sup>1</sup> But as Cajetan has well shown, Theology may be called ‘science,’ inasmuch as its object is necessarily and immutably true; but it is an imperfect science, because he doth not truly know who cannot resolve his knowledge into evident principles. And this accords with S. Paul’s saying, “For we know in part, and we pro-

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* §. 8.

<sup>1</sup> *Loci Theologici*, L. xii. p. 348.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologiæ*, Part. I. qu.

1. art. 2.

phesy in part.”<sup>k</sup> Origen defines wisdom (*σοφία*) as the “science of divine and human things and of their causes;”<sup>l</sup> but then he recognises it as the first and chiefest of spiritual gifts (*χαρίσματα*). “Divine Wisdom,” he says, being different from Faith, “is the first of the so-called *gifts* of God; and second, to those who would be accurate in such matters, is Knowledge so-called; and third (since the simpler sort too that give heed to Religion according to their power need to be saved) is Faith. Wherefore it is said by Paul, ‘For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit.’”<sup>m</sup> Whence you will not find ordinary persons partakers of Divine Wisdom, but those that surpass all Christians.”<sup>n</sup> He is however considering the apprehension of Divine Mysteries in an esoteric sense, removed from our present purpose. Bearing in mind the universal necessity of Faith in all classes of the saved, Mohammed’s words are true and profound: “Conviction is a flash of Divine mercy, not a matter of science.” (*Korân*, p. 269.)

And so it remains, that Theology is not properly a science, but only in a large sense, by calling ‘science, a habit whereby something is concluded from premisses true in themselves but not manifest to the person that draws conclusions from them.’<sup>o</sup> The Church may be obliged to use terms such as were not in use afore, and even to give them passport and authority in the public service of the Church; but such terms only serve to exclude the importunities of heresies and to teach us how to express ourselves according to the faith of the Church. So such terms as ‘Trinity,’ ‘Transsubstantiation,’ &c., should not lightly be challenged on the mere ground of novelty. The main issue depends on the correctness of their application. (See Thorndike, *Of the Covenant of Grace*, chap. xvii. §§ 31, 36, 38.)

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Contra Celsum, L. iii. p. 159.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9.

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.* L. v. p. 292. See also

Clemens Alex., Strom. L. vii. p. 521.

<sup>o</sup> Durand *ubi supra*, §. 53. See also Scharpii Cursus Theologicus, p. 4.

## CHAPTER II.

## OF SCRIPTURE THE RULE OF FAITH.

§. 1. "ALL Scripture," saith S. Paul, "is given by inspiration of GOD, and is profitable for doctrine." <sup>p</sup> And our LORD Himself saith, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me." <sup>q</sup> If such is the language applied to the Scriptures of the Old Testament by our LORD and His Apostles, with how much greater force should it be applied to their own recorded sayings? S. John doth in fact assign such paramount importance to his own Gospel; "But these are written that ye might believe that JESUS is the CHRIST, the SON of GOD; and that believing ye might have life through His name." <sup>r</sup> And S. Peter very clearly implies, that, although the truth had been fully delivered by oral teaching to the Christians whom he addressed, he was still desirous of leaving on record a perpetual written memorial of the substance of what he had taught them; as if nothing would fully compensate the loss of the testimony of such as had been from the beginning eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word. He saith, "Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth." "Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, but were eyewitnesses of His Majesty." <sup>s</sup> That is, writes Cæcumenius, "I do not this con-

Of the authority of Holy Scripture as paramount in matters of Faith.

<sup>p</sup> 2 Tim. iii. 16.

<sup>q</sup> S. John v. 39.

<sup>r</sup> S. John xx. 31.

<sup>s</sup> 2 S. Pet. i. 12, 15, 16.

demning your ignorance, but by the continuity of teaching about these things I labour that your hold of them may be abiding and unchangeable; that having been confirmed by them ye may even after my departure out of this life retain them sounding in your ears, and indelible.”<sup>†</sup>

So important did the early Church consider the testimony of the original eyewitnesses of CHRIST to be, and so careful were they to trace the doctrines of the Faith to their primary source, that we find Tertullian actually distinguishing between the Apostles and Apostolic men among the writers of the four Gospels. “We lay it down in the first place,” he says, “that the Evangelical document had for its authors Apostles, on whom this office of promulgating the Gospel was imposed by the LORD Himself. If it had Apostolic men too, yet not alone, but with Apostles and after Apostles. Since the preaching of disciples might come to be suspected of desire of glory, if the authority of their masters did not assist them, yea of CHRIST who made their masters Apostles.”<sup>‡</sup> The compendious mode of proof, borrowed from the prescriptive tradition of the Church, might be adduced to establish the claims of Scripture to be received as what it professed to be, that is, the revelation of God’s Will; but once those claims were allowed, the appeal of Catholics in their controversies with heretics was to Scripture. In his Dialogue against the Marcionites, Origen makes the heretic Marinus appeal to Scripture only. “If ye would,” saith he, “that the inquiry be made with all truth, waive matters of philosophy, complying with the Scriptures alone.” Adamantius replies, “Let us comply with the Scriptures.”<sup>¶</sup> And when Dionysius of Alexandria had a conference with certain Egyptian presbyters who were pushing their opinions about the Millennium to the verge of schism, both parties are represented as “accepting what was sustained by proofs and teachings of the Holy Scriptures.”<sup>¶</sup> Nor was it otherwise in the great Arian controversy; the Bishop Alexander and his clergy, in the circular wherein they communicate to the

<sup>†</sup> *Œcumen. in loc.* T. II. p. 534.

<sup>‡</sup> v. p. 130.

<sup>¶</sup> *Adv. Marcionem*, L. iv. p. 414.

<sup>¶</sup> *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* L. vii. c.

<sup>¶</sup> *Dialog. contra Marcionitas*, §.

24.

universal Church the deposition of Arius, expressly declare that "unfolding the Divine Scriptures they had frequently refuted him."<sup>a</sup>

The object of obtaining a public declaration of Faith in a General Council was to justify the excision on a large scale of members of the Church who had already been excommunicated by their own Bishop in virtue of the power of discipline vested in his office, and to obtain more solemn sanctions of that sense which it was assumed was universally entertained in the Church respecting the interpretation of Holy Scripture. It was never pretended that Christians might individually or collectively propound articles of Faith which they did not at the same time profess to be contained *implicitly* or explicitly in Holy Scripture. S. Athanasius himself, the great light of the Nicene Council, writes to Macarius; "The holy and inspired Scriptures suffice of themselves for the enunciation of the truth; but there are many discourses also of our blessed doctors composed for this purpose, which if a person meets with he shall in a manner know the interpretation of the Scriptures, and obtain the knowledge which he desires."<sup>b</sup> So, likewise, the Council of Carthage, A.D. 348, declares that they make their decrees "mindful of the Divine precepts and of the ruling (*magisterii*) of the Divine Scriptures;"<sup>c</sup> and that their "sentence is not to be passed, but rather executed, in cases which Scripture hath openly sanctioned."<sup>d</sup> And a beautiful illustration of this feeling is supplied by the practice of subsequent Councils; when a copy of the Holy Gospels used to be reverently placed on a throne in the midst of the assembly, as the most fitting symbol of Him who spake of old through the Prophets, the Comforter and Spirit of Truth. The Faith, S. Athanasius argued, "was clear to all, being known and read out of the Divine Scriptures; for in it the saints that have been perfected were martyred, and now are at rest in the LORD. And the Faith would have remained uninjured continually, if the evil disposition of certain heretics had not dared to pervert it."<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Labbe, T. II. p. 147.

<sup>b</sup> *Ib.* p. 718.

<sup>c</sup> S. Athan. *Contra Gentes* Orat.

<sup>d</sup> S. Athan. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II.

T. I. p. 1.

p. 823.

<sup>e</sup> Labbe, *Conc.* T. II. p. 713.

In the conference between the Catholics and the Donatists at Carthage, A.D. 411, the same tradition of Appeal to the Scripture is continued, and the Scripture declared to be the Church's Rule. Marcellinus the commissioner says, "If the consent of both parties agrees that nothing be done on the side of the common law, but that all things be performed by ecclesiastical rules, that is, testimonies of the Old and New Testaments, let either party signify it." <sup>c</sup> And S. Augustine spoke thus at the same Conference; "We retain that Church, which we have found in those Scriptures, in which also we have known CHRIST; forasmuch as our Scriptures, to whose authority we are alike subject, commend CHRIST and the Church as a holy wedded pair, CHRIST the Bridegroom, her the Bride. Where we know Him, there also ought we to find her. If therefore at the outset we were thinking to what communion of Christians in Africa we should attach ourselves, doubtless we ought to hold that which we do find in the Scriptures; and, repudiating men's charges, keep to the Divine Oracles alone, which know not falsehood." <sup>d</sup> Pope Zosimus, in his letter to the African Bishops, A.D. 417, says; "I admonish your charity as well by the authority of the Apostolic See as by the mutual affection of love, that now your understandings be content with the precepts of all the Holy Scriptures, which have been ordained according to the tradition of our fathers. What is not abundant there? What is not full of the Spirit and words of GOD? unless it pleases every one to trust himself rather, and to use his own judgment concerning himself." <sup>e</sup>

S. Optatus, arguing with the Donatists touching their re-baptizing proselytes from the Catholic Church, brings out very clearly the mind of the Church about the Rule of Faith. "Arbitrators are wanted. If Christians, they cannot be given on either side, because truth is hindered by party spirit. A judge is to be sought for outside. If a Pagan, he cannot know Christian secrets. If a Jew, he is an enemy of Christian Baptism. Therefore on earth no judgment can be found touching this matter; a judge is to be sought for from

<sup>c</sup> Labbe, T. II. p. 1359.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1468.

<sup>e</sup> *Ib.* p. 1560.

Heaven. But why entreat we Heaven, when we have His Testament here in the Gospel? Since in this place earthly things may rightly be compared with heavenly; it is like the case of a man having numerous sons. These their father himself, as long as he is present, orders one and all: a testament is not yet necessary. So also CHRIST, as long as He was present on earth, enjoined on the Apostles whatever was necessary for the time. But as when an earthly father, perceiving himself on the brink of death, and fearing lest thereafter the brothers should break the peace and go to law, takes witnesses and transfers his will from his dying breast into tablets that shall endure for a long while; and if contention shall have arisen among the brothers, they do not make an uproar, but the will is sought for, and he who rests in the tomb silently speaks from the tablets: so He, the Living One, Whose the Testament is, is in Heaven; therefore His Will may be sought in the Gospel even as in a testament."<sup>f</sup>

And in the Middle Ages it was the doctrine of John Duns Scotus, that Holy Scripture sufficiently contains the teaching necessary to one that journeys through this life to his eternal home. The explanation of God's commandments, as far as relates to faith and practice, is elicited from divers passages of Scripture.<sup>g</sup> Aquinas states, that a Theologian uses authorities of Canonical Scripture as necessary positions; but he argues on grounds of probability only, when he employs the authorities of the Doctors of the Church. "For our Faith," he says, "rests on the revelation made to the Apostles and Prophets who wrote the Canonical Books, but not on any revelation (if any were made) to other teachers."<sup>h</sup> And Durandus writes: "I conclude then with the Apostle; 'Praying also for us, that GOD would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of CHRIST, that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.'<sup>i</sup> But we ought to speak of the mystery of CHRIST, and universally of those things which absolutely touch faith, in conformity with that which Scripture delivers. Whence CHRIST saith; 'Search the Scriptures;

<sup>f</sup> S. Optatus, L. v. p. 85.

<sup>g</sup> Scotus, in *Prolog.* Sent. qu. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Summa Theol. I. qu. 1. Art. 8.

<sup>i</sup> Col. iv. 3, 4.



they are they which testify of Me.'<sup>j</sup> But if any one doth not observe this, he speaketh not of the mystery of CHRIST and of the things that directly touch the faith as he ought, but comes under that which the Apostle saith, 'And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know.'<sup>k</sup> For the way is not to exceed the measure of faith; whereof the Apostle saith, we should 'think soberly, according as GOD hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.'<sup>l</sup> Which measure consists in two things, namely, not to withdraw from faith what belongs to it, nor to attribute to faith what is not comprehended under it. For in either manner the measure of faith is exceeded, and we deviate from the contents of Sacred Scripture, which expresses the measure of faith; and this measure by GOD's help we wish to hold, so as not to write or teach anything dissonant from Holy Scripture. But if through ignorance or inadvertency we should write anything dissonant, let it be *ipso facto* held for not written."<sup>m</sup>

I conclude with Damascene; "all that hath been handed down to us through the Law and Prophets and Apostles and Evangelists we receive and venerate, seeking nothing further. These things let us embrace, and in them abide, not removing the eternal boundaries nor transgressing the Divine Tradition."<sup>n</sup>

Of the  
Canon of  
Scripture.

§. 2. Having treated of the Holy Scriptures as constituting the paramount Rule of Faith, it follows that we should examine the Canon of Scripture, and in so doing touch cursorily the question concerning the authority of the Septuagint version and of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. In the front of the inquiry a Rule of criticism occurs, which has found room equally in Gratian's Digest of the Ancient Canon Law<sup>o</sup> and in the draft of the Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws intended by the English Reformers to have become the New Canon Law of England.<sup>p</sup> It is this: "As the fidelity of the Ancient Books is to be examined from the Hebrew

<sup>j</sup> S. John v. 39.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Rom. xii. 3.

<sup>m</sup> In *Prol.* Sent. qu. 1, §. 12.

<sup>n</sup> De *Orthodoxa Fide*, c. 1.

<sup>o</sup> I. Dist. ix. c. 6.

<sup>p</sup> *Reformatio Legum, de Fide Catholica*, cap. 12.

volumes, so that of the New requires the rule of the Greek speech."<sup>a</sup> S. Jerome gives the reason of this adherence to the Hebrew in these words; "Apostolic men use the Hebrew Scriptures; that the Apostles and Evangelists themselves did this is clear. Our LORD and SAVIOUR, wheresoever He mentions the Old Scripture, puts examples from the Hebrew volumes: as in that passage, 'He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.'<sup>r</sup> And on the Cross itself, 'My GOD, My GOD, wherefore hast thou forsaken Me;' not as it has been put by the Septuagint, 'My GOD, my GOD, look upon me, wherefore hast thou forsaken me:' and many things like these. Nor do we say this to undermine the credit of the Seventy Interpreters, but because the authority of CHRIST and His Apostles is greater; and wherever the Septuagint do not differ from the Hebrew, there the Apostles took examples from their interpretation; but where they differ, they put that in the Greek which they had learnt from the Hebrews."<sup>s</sup>

A favourite way of enumerating the Books which made up the Hebrew Canon of Scripture was to arrange them according to the number of the Hebrew Letters.<sup>t</sup> Thus S. Cyril of Jerusalem classifies them as twelve historical Books, 1. Genesis, 2. Exodus, 3. Leviticus, 4. Numbers, 5. Deuteronomy, 6. Joshua, 7. Judges, Ruth; 8. the first and second books of Kings; 9. the third and fourth books of Kings; 10. the first and second books of Paraleipomena (Chronicles); 11. the first and second books of Esdras (Ezra and Nehemiah), 12. Esther: five metrical Books, 13. Job, 14. the Psalms, 15. Proverbs, 16. Ecclesiastes, 17. the Song of Songs: and five Prophetical Books, 18. Isaiah, 19. Jeremiah and the Lamentations, 20. Ezekiel, 21. Daniel, 22. the twelve Minor Prophets. Cyril prefaces this catalogue with these remarks: "Read the two and twenty Books of these men" (meaning the Septuagint), "and have nothing to do with the Apocrypha." (He means legendary and supposititious writings.)

<sup>a</sup> S. Hieronymus, Ep. 28. Opp. Tom. I. p. 83.

<sup>r</sup> S. John vii. 38.

<sup>s</sup> *Id.* Apologia adv. Eufinum, cap. ix. p. 251.

<sup>t</sup> Hence Nazianzen's distich,—  
Ἀρχαίαι μὲν ἔθνηκα δύο καὶ εἰκοσι  
β. β. λους. τοῖς τῶν Ἑβραίων γράμμασιν  
ἀντιθέτους.

"These books alone study diligently, which also we read in church with confidence. Far more prudent were the Apostles and the ancient Bishops the presidents of the Church, who handed down these things. Do not you then being a son of the Church corrupt the ordinances."<sup>a</sup>

The most ancient catalogue of the Books of the Old Testament which we possess from a Christian source is that of Melito, Bishop of Sardis (A.D. 160), which has the peculiar recommendation of the writer's assurance that he had travelled to the East, the 'land of the Bible,' and satisfied himself on the spot where the sacred transactions occurred. That catalogue is in exact accordance with S. Cyril's.<sup>v</sup> So is that of Origen (A.D. 220), reported by Eusebius;<sup>w</sup> for the omission of the Twelve Minor Prophets is nothing else but the fault of the transcriber, which Nicephorus Callistus supplies.<sup>x</sup> S. Athanasius (A.D. 340) gives the same number of two and twenty, and adds significantly: "These are the wells of salvation, so that he that thirsteth may be filled with the oracles contained in them; in these alone the school of piety is preached. Let no one add to them, nor take away aught from them."<sup>y</sup> S. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers (A.D. 350), gives the same number;<sup>z</sup> and the Council of Laodiceæ (A.D. 364), the first expression of the collective voice of the Church which we have on the subject.<sup>a</sup> One only and that a seeming drawback occurs, that is, that Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremy are included in the Book of Jeremiah; but, as Bishop Cosin has shown, the name of Baruch was probably added by the writers succeeding Origen, because of his having been Jeremiah's scribe, and having been required by him to write, so that there may seem to be a sort of joint authorship between them; and the Epistle of Jeremiah is included in the xxixth Chapter of his Prophecy.<sup>b</sup> S. Epiphanius (A.D. 374) brings the tradition down to the time of S. Jerome,<sup>c</sup> whose authority our Church has followed. Other testimonies may be added,

<sup>a</sup> S. Cyrill. Hierosol. Cateches. iv. c. 22.

<sup>v</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iv. 26.

<sup>w</sup> *Ib.* vi. 25.

<sup>x</sup> Hist. Eccles. v. 16.

<sup>y</sup> S. Athan. Ep. 39. Opp. T. II. p. 39.

<sup>a</sup> In Psalm. Prolog.

<sup>z</sup> Labbe, T. I. p. 1507.

<sup>b</sup> See Bp. Cosin's Scholastical History of the Canon of the Scripture, §. 61.

<sup>c</sup> Epiph. Opp. T. I. p. 19.

such as the lists given by the Apostolical Canons<sup>d</sup> and Constitutions,<sup>e</sup> by S. Basil,<sup>f</sup> and S. Amphilochius of Iconium (A.D. 378).<sup>g</sup>

Against this array of witnesses, the earliest synodical list, which includes the Apocryphal Books in the Canon of Scripture, is that of the IIIrd Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), at which S. Augustine assisted.<sup>h</sup> It rehearses as canonical *five* books of Solomon, Tobias, Judith, and two books of Maccabees. Even so the whole of the present Apocryphal books is not included. And as S. Augustine was present, we may see from his own writings with what qualifications and with what motives such a decision may have been arrived at. Speaking of the books of Solomon, he saith: "But *custom* hath obtained that two others, whereof the one is called Wisdom, the other Ecclesiasticus, should be called Solomon's on account of some resemblance of style, yet the more learned doubt not that they are not his; the Church however, *chiefly the Western*, hath of old received them for authority: whereof in one, which is called the Wisdom of Solomon, the Passion of CHRIST is most openly prophesied; (He then quotes Wisdom ii. 12–21.) And in Ecclesiasticus the future faith of the Gentiles is predicted in this manner. (He quotes Ecclus. xxxvi. 1–5.)"<sup>i</sup> In another passage he equally exhibits the motive, which induced the African Church to deviate in this particular from the more correct practice of the Eastern and elder Church. Speaking of the Jewish Asmonæan Princes he saith; "the reckoning of whose times is not found in the Holy Scriptures which are called Canonical, but in others, wherein are also the books of Maccabees, which the Jews do not, but the Church doth hold for Canonical, because of the vehement and admirable sufferings of certain Martyrs, who before CHRIST came in the flesh contended even unto death for the law of God and sustained most heavy and horrible evils."<sup>j</sup>

Against this inaccurate but pious arrangement I will cite

<sup>d</sup> Labbe, I. 44.

<sup>e</sup> *Ib.* 294, Lib. ii. c. 57.

<sup>f</sup> Philocalia, c. 3.

<sup>g</sup> *Ap. Beveregii Synodicon*, T. II. p. 179.

<sup>h</sup> Labbe, T. II. p. 1177, canon 47.

<sup>i</sup> S. Aug. De Civitate Dei, Lib. xvii. c. 20. T. VII. p. 483.

<sup>j</sup> *Ibid.* L. xviii. c. 36. T. VII. p. 519.

S. Athanasius in continuation of his remarks above quoted ; “ But for the sake of greater accuracy I add, even writing this necessarily, how that there are also other books beside these, not canonized indeed, but appointed by the fathers to be read by those that recently come over to us and wish to be instructed in the word of piety : the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, and Tobias, the Doctrine (so called) of the Apostles, and the Shepherd [of Hermas].”<sup>\*</sup> And S. Jerome writes : “ As then the Church reads indeed the books of Judith and Tobias and of the Maccabees, but doth not receive them among canonical Scriptures ; so also let her read these two volumes (Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom) for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas.”<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thomas Jackson well expresses the force of the evidence in favour of the Hebrew Canon ; “ That all sorts of Protestants, Papists, and Jews, do receive them, is an infallible argument that He Who is LORD of all did commend them to all. Nor doth our Church so disclaim all which the Romans above these two and twenty admit, as if it were a point of Faith to hold there were no more : it only admits no more into the same rank and order with the former, because we have no such warrant of faith or sure experiments so to do. Many of them discover themselves to be Apocryphal : and albeit some of them can very hardly or not at all be discerned for such by their style, character, or dissonancy to Canonical Scriptures ; yet, that none of them indeed are or can be admitted for Canonical, without manifest tempting of GOD, is evident from what hath been observed before, concerning GOD’s unspeakable Providence in making the blinded and perfidious Jews, (CHRIST’S and our bitterest enemies), such trusty Feoffees for making over the assurances of Life unto us. For seeing by them He commended unto us only so many Books of the Old Testament as our Church acknowledgeth ; this is an infallible argument that His Will was that we should admit no more. Had any more been written before the re-edifying of the Temple by Zerubbabel, no doubt the Jews would have admitted them into their

<sup>\*</sup> Opp. T. II. p. 39.

<sup>1</sup> S. Hieron. in Proverbia Præfatione, T. I. p. 346.

Canon.”<sup>m</sup> This last remark of Jackson is countenanced by a passage of Damascene’s; where, speaking of the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, he says, “They are excellent and good, but are not reckoned (in the Canon), nor did they lie in the Ark.”<sup>n</sup> Franciscus à Sancta Clara mentions that Cardinal Cajetan even after the Council of Florence allowed that the controverted books are rightly called Canonical on account of the authority of certain Councils and Fathers, but in a *dissimilar degree*, namely, not for the fashioning of Faith, but for the instruction of manners, as Ruffinus formerly said in his Exposition of the Creed. He joins Franciscus Mirandula and S. Antoninus with him.<sup>o</sup>

We should be cautious how we conclude, that, *because* portions of Christendom possess not the entire Bible, or if its records suffer decay through various readings or lapse of copyists, therefore the “Church is disparaged, so long as the effect of them remains written by the Holy Ghost in the hearts and lives of Christians;” remembering S. Paul makes ‘the ministry of the Gospel’ to be ‘that of the spirit,’ not ‘of the letter.’ (Thorndike, Vol. II. Part II. p. 671). The spirit of God’s Word survives and excels the letter.

§. 3. Having thus allowed the superior authority of the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament and of the original Hebrew Text, I think it right to subjoin what S. Augustine saith of the authority of the Septuagint Version. “This edition, which is of the Seventy, the Church hath so received as though it were the only one; and the Greek Christian populations use it, whereof most are ignorant whether there be any other. From this interpretation of the Seventy also hath been interpreted into the Latin language that which the Latin Churches hold. Although there hath not been wanting in our times the presbyter Hieronymus, a most learned man and skilled in all the three languages, who hath turned the same Scriptures not from the Greek but from the Hebrew into the Latin speech. But his so learned labour however the Jews may acknowledge to be veracious, contending that

Of the authority due to the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament.

<sup>m</sup> Jackson’s Works, Vol. I. p. 163.

<sup>o</sup> Franc. à S. Clara, Deus, Na-

<sup>n</sup> De Orth. Fide, cap. 94. See tura, Gratia, p. 341.  
also S. Epiphani. T. II. p. 162.

the Seventy Interpreters erred in many things; yet the Churches of CHRIST judge that no man should be preferred to the authority of so many men chosen to this important work by Eleazar then High Priest." <sup>p</sup> I omit the rest, as founded on a mere legend, derided by S. Jerome. Thorndike infers from internal evidence of idiom &c. that the so-called Septuagint Version was the work of Alexandrian Jews. (Vol. II. Pt. II. pp. 643, 645-648.)

Of the Canon  
of the New  
Testament.

§. 4. Much less need be said touching the Canon of the New Testament; for although the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse, may have been doubted of in ancient times, that doubt, as Jackson writes, "is now diminished by their continuance in the sacred Canon so long time, not without manifest documents of God's Providence in preserving them; Whose pleasure (it may seem) was to have these books, of whom the Ancients most doubted, fenced and guarded on the one side by S. Paul's Epistles and other Canonical Scriptures (never called in question by any but absurd and foolish heretics, whose humorous opinions herein died with themselves) and on the other by the book of the Apocalypse; of whose authority, though many of the Ancients for the time being doubted, yet He that was before all times did foresee that it should in later times manifest itself to be His work by events answerable to the prophecies contained in it. And, albeit many Apocryphal books have been stamped with divine titles and obtruded upon the Church as Canonical, whilst she was in her infancy and the Sacred Canon newly constitute: yet the Divine SPIRIT by Which it was written hath wrought them out, as new wine doth such filth or grossness as mingle with it whilst the grapes are trodden. S. John's adjuration in the conclusion of that book hath not only terrified all for adding unto or diminishing itself; but hath been as it were a seal unto the rest of this Sacred Volume of the New Testament, as Malachi's Prophecy was to the Old." <sup>q</sup>

<sup>p</sup> S. Aug. De Civit. Dei, L. xviii. c. 43. T. VII. p. 525. See also *Ibid.*

L. xv. c. 14. VII. p. 395; and L. xv. c. 23. VII. p. 408.

<sup>q</sup> Jackson's Works, Vol. I. p. 164.

§. 5. In the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, the mind of the writers, or rather of the Divine SPIRIT Who guided their utterance, is collected according to the Literal otherwise termed the Historical or Grammatical sense, and according to the Spiritual or Mystical; which latter sense again is subdivided into the Allegorical, the Moral or Tropological, and the Anagogical. The Literal Sense is that which the words themselves signify; and this may be regarded as proper or figurative and metaphorical. The Spiritual Sense is that which the things signified by the words indicate. Of its subdivisions we call the first Allegorical, when the things done in the Old Testament signify those which were to be done in the New; whereof an example is supplied by S. Paul, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning CHRIST and the Church."<sup>r</sup> The second we call Moral or Tropological, when things done in the Old or New Testament indicate those which we ourselves ought to do; as we read in S. Paul, "For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth GOD take care for oxen? Or saith He it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope."<sup>s</sup> The third we call Anagogical, when those things which happen in the Church Militant touching its Head, that is, CHRIST, or the members of the Church signify those that shall or do take place in the Triumphant, that is, in life eternal; and of this we have an instance in S. Paul's language, "But ye are come unto Mount Siou, and unto the city of the living GOD, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels."<sup>t</sup>

Of the different senses of Scripture; the Literal and the Spiritual.

It hath been beautifully though fancifully remarked by Alexander De Hales, that the Anagogical sense which is from above leads to the First Principle, and is referred to the First Person in the Blessed Trinity, as it implies things known

<sup>r</sup> Ephes. v. 31, 32.

<sup>s</sup> Heb. xii. 22.

<sup>t</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10.



only in that state of glory when we shall "see Him as He is:"<sup>u</sup> the Allegorical, which enunciates the secrets of the Prime Verity, is referred to the Second Person, Who "was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;"<sup>v</sup> while the Moral, which orders the highest goodness, is referred to the Third Person, "because the love of GOD is shed abroad in our hearts by the HOLY GHOST which is given unto us."<sup>w</sup>

That holy Scripture hath not only the literal but also the spiritual sense, we have its own authority in asserting. For CHRIST Himself and the Canonical writers often declare that either sense is contained in some passages of Scripture. Thus CHRIST saith, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up."<sup>x</sup> And again: "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."<sup>y</sup> And in the sixth chapter of S. John that which is in the xiith of Exodus said literally of the Paschal Lamb the Evangelist teacheth to have been said spiritually of CHRIST; "A bone of him shall not be broken."<sup>z</sup> And in the second chapter of S. Matthew, what is said literally of the people of Israel in Hosea,<sup>a</sup> "Out of Egypt have I called My son," is spiritually accommodated to the Child JESUS. The same assertion is besides proved 1 Cor. chapter x.; where, when the Apostle had said that the Fathers were all under the cloud, he subjoins, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples (τύποι);"<sup>b</sup> and in the ivth chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians he interprets the history of the two sons of Abraham to relate allegorically to the two Testaments and Peoples, whereof the one was carnal, the other spiritual. In writing on which passage Jerome argues from that testimony of S. Paul that the spiritual sense also is contained in Scripture.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>u</sup> 1 S. John iii. 2.

<sup>v</sup> S. John i. 9.

<sup>w</sup> Rom. v. 5. See Alexander Alensis, Theologiæ Summa, qu. 2. art. 4.

<sup>x</sup> S. John iii. 14.

<sup>y</sup> S. Matt. xii. 40.

<sup>z</sup> S. John xix. 36.

<sup>a</sup> Hos. xi.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. x. 11.

<sup>c</sup> See Gregorius De Valentia, Commentarii Theologici, Tom. I. pp. 41, 42. See also S. Tho. Aquinas, Summa Theol. I. qu. 1. art. 10.

Origen claims universal Tradition for this twofold sense : "Then lastly," he says, "through the HOLY SPIRIT the Scriptures were written, and they have a meaning, not that alone which is on the surface, but also another hidden one, as many of them as possible. For these things are the forms of certain mysteries, and the images of Divine things. Concerning which the sense of the whole Church is *one*, that the whole Law is indeed spiritual; that those things however which the Law intimates are not known save to those alone to whom the grace of the HOLY SPIRIT is granted in the word of wisdom and knowledge sufficiently follows."<sup>a</sup>

It is easy indeed to cast discredit on the mystical sense of Scripture by citing instances of its perversion. Perhaps no one went to greater lengths in this respect than Origen himself. But the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus proves that there is danger also on the other side, namely, in the over rigid adherence to the literal sense. The gravity of the subject forbids the indulgence of the humour, which brands the adherents of the literal sense as Nestorians and Rationalists according to the varying periods of history, or delights to attach the odium of Eutychianism and fanaticism to the champions of the mystical sense. Both schools of interpretation have their room in Scripture; both tendencies have ever existed in the Catholic Church. But it must be confessed that, however the school of literal interpretation may suit the habits and pursuits of an active and busy age, the study of the spiritual sense of Scripture is commended to us by the marked predilection of the earlier and purer centuries; and that, while the Literal School may be more fitted to form Christian Philosophers, the Mystical has been the fruitful nursery of Christian Saints. I will only add two cautions; the one against confounding mere accommodation of Scripture with the spiritual sense; for a truth of that kind is properly no sense of Scripture itself, since the Author of Scripture did not in the least intend to signify it, either by the words of Scripture, that is, literally, or by the things most nearly signified by the words, that is, spiritually.\* The

<sup>a</sup> Origen. Peri Archon, Lib. i. in Proœmio, p. 421.

\* Greg. De Valentia, *ubi supra*.

other shall relate to the proportion of the spiritual to the literal sense. Thus Jackson: "Concerning this symbolical or moral sense (especially when it is not prophetical,) Maldonat's advice is very good; he that will search after such senses must hold close to the letter. 'Propius mihi Rupertus videtur in quærendo morali sensu ad literalem accessisse; quod semper faciendum esse ei, qui ridiculus esse nolit, sæpe monuimus.' And of allegorical, mystical, or symbolical senses which are prophetical or prefigurative, none are current or concludent but such as hold exact proportion with the sense historical." <sup>f</sup>

Fulness of  
Primitive  
testimony  
to the para-  
mount au-  
thority of  
Scripture.

§. 6. The exhibition of Scripture as the paramount Rule of Faith is not complete without affording a notion of the fulness of heart and absence of reserve, with which the Primitive Church urged on its members, without distinction of lay and cleric, the duty of studying that precious deposit of Revelation. It is thus that S. Gregory the Great exhorts Theodore, a physician, to the daily reading of Holy Scripture. "I have some complaint in regard of my most glorious son *Dom*<sup>g</sup> Theodore; because, having received the gifts of natural wit, of means, of mercy and charity from the HOLY TRINITY, he yet is unceasingly tied by secular matters, he is occupied with continual journeys, and neglects to read daily the words of his Redeemer. But what is Holy Scripture, unless a sort of letter of Almighty God to his creature? And certainly if at any time your Glory were from home and were to receive the writing of the emperor of the world, you would not rest, nor give sleep to your eyes, till you had first learnt what he had written to you. The Emperor of Heaven, the LORD of men and Angels, hath sent to you His letters, which concern your life; and yet, glorious son, you neglect to read the same with ardour. Study then, I pray, and daily meditate the words of your CREATOR. Learn GOD's heart in the words of GOD, that your mind may with greater desires be kindled to things of Heaven." <sup>h</sup>

And in the eighth century, when the dark clouds of

<sup>f</sup> Works, Vol. II. p. 601.

<sup>g</sup> I employ the monastic style of *Dom* as the nearest rendering of

the original *Domnus*; the substitution of *lord* is simply misleading.

<sup>h</sup> S. Greg. P.P. I Lib. iv. Ep. 40. *ap. Labbe T. V. p. 1196*

superstition and ignorance were lowering on the Church, Damascene still writes about the Scripture with the glowing love and piety of early times. "All Scripture," he saith, "is in every respect Divinely inspired and profitable; so that it is most beneficial to the soul to search it. For as a tree planted by the watercourses, so also a soul irrigated by the Divine Scripture battens and yields seasonable fruit (*that is*) orthodox faith, and is adorned with evergreen leaves, I mean, with works agreeable to God; since by the Holy Scriptures we are moulded to virtuous action and undisturbed contemplation, by them exhorted to all virtue and dissuaded from all vice. If then we be lovers of learning, we shall also learn much; for all things succeed by study and labour and the grace of God the Giver. 'He that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.'<sup>1</sup> Let us knock then at the most beautiful paradise of the Scriptures, most sweet and fragrant, that resounds in our ears with all kinds of songs of intellectual God-inspired birds; that lays hold of our heart, soothing it when in pain, calming it when stirred by passion, and filling it with everlasting joy; that setteth our understanding on the golden back of the Divine Dove, and on its brightest wings leadeth us up to the Only-Begotten Son and heir of the planter of the intellectual vineyard, and through Him bringeth us near to the Father of Lights. But let us not knock idly, yea, rather earnestly and continuously. Let us not faint in knocking, for so shall it be opened to us. If we read once and again, and do not quite perceive what we read, let us not faint, but tarry; let us converse, let us ask; for 'ask thy father' it says 'and he shall declare it to thee; thy elders, and they shall tell thee;' for knowledge belongeth not to all. Let us draw out of the well of this paradise ever-flowing and purest waters springing up to life eternal. Let us luxuriate in them and take our fill, for they possess grace free of cost. And if we can derive any profit also from what is beside them, it is not forbidden. Let us become approved moneychangers, laying up the genuine and pure gold, but rejecting the counterfeit."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> S. Matt. vii. 7.<sup>2</sup> S. Joan. Damascen. De Orth. Fide, cap. 24.

## CHAPTER III.

OF CATHOLIC TRADITION AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE  
CHURCH.

Origin of  
Church  
Authority  
in matters  
of Faith.

§. 1. HAVING thus maintained at length the supreme authority of Holy Scripture as the Rule of Faith and the source from which all Theological investigations spring, and to which they must ever be subject, we now ask what need there is of noticing the subsidiary fences of Faith, when Scripture has already been given to us as an infallible Rule and Guide. The Apostles address Christians as divinely illuminated, as possessing the Spirit of promise Who should guide them "into all truth,"<sup>k</sup> as "no longer under a school-master."<sup>l</sup> S. Paul saith, "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man;"<sup>m</sup> and again, he applies to the Church the prophecy of Jeremiah, "And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for all shall know Me from the least to the greatest."<sup>n</sup> And S. John saith, "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things;"<sup>o</sup> and again, "But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him."<sup>p</sup> And following apparently the leading of such passages, our profound Divine, Dr. Jackson, hesitates not to affirm, "That the Infallible Rule, whereupon every Christian, in matters of written veri-

<sup>k</sup> S. John xvi. 13.

<sup>l</sup> Gal. iii. 25.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 15.

<sup>n</sup> Heb. viii. 11.

<sup>o</sup> 1 S. John ii. 20.

<sup>p</sup> 1 S. John ii. 27.

ties absolutely and finally without all appeal, condition, or reservation, is to rely, must be the Divine Written Oracles themselves; some of which every Christian hath written in his heart by the finger of God's Spirit, and believes immediately in and for themselves, and not for any authority; and these to him must be the Rule for examining all other doctrines and trying any matters of Faith."<sup>a</sup>

This large liberty, however it may stand in the tribunal of conscience, will evidently need limitation, the moment the individual Christian discovers that he is placed in religious relations to others, who equally with himself have received the same Divine Rule of Faith. Spiritual illumination is heralded by love and accompanied by peace: "and the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."<sup>r</sup> The interposition of any species of Church Authority in matters of Faith arises from the mutual relation and interdependence of Christians in the one Body Corporate and Divine Society, the Catholic Church. The same Apostle, who so vividly enhances the glory of the law of liberty which we enjoy in the Gospel, takes care to impress on our minds the fact, that there is 'one body' as well as One Spirit, one outward baptism as well as one inward faith.<sup>s</sup> We are told, not that we are elected to the inheritance of life independently of others, but that in CHRIST "all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the LORD: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of GOD through the Spirit."<sup>t</sup> And S. Peter saith, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to GOD by JESUS CHRIST."<sup>u</sup> And in the very conclusion of the Sacred Canon, the Church the Spouse of CHRIST is joined with the voice of the Spirit; "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come."<sup>v</sup>

This harmony and co-operation of Christians is secured by their being moulded into one Visible Society, in which is vested not only a power of discipline but also authority to

<sup>a</sup> Works, Vol. I. p. 186.

<sup>r</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33.

<sup>s</sup> Eph. iv. 4, 5.

<sup>t</sup> Eph. ii. 21, 22.

<sup>u</sup> 1 S. Pet. ii. 5.

<sup>v</sup> Rev. xxii. 17.

regulate the enunciation of the doctrines of Faith, so that it should not be in the power of any individual to teach *publicly in its name* novel expositions at variance with that which had been once delivered. And as the action of this Society would be uncertain and irregular, if no machinery had been devised for its healthy and orderly working, it pleased its Founder from its first institution to appoint His commissioners to superintend its operation. For "He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of CHRIST." \* And that this appointment of the Apostolic Ministry had not merely the administration of discipline for its object but also bore principally on the preservation of true doctrine, S. Paul clearly implies, where he calls them 'children,' "carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness of deceivers." † In the Epistle to Titus he also characterises a Bishop as one "holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught;" and that 'taught' he calls sound 'doctrine.' ‡ This august ideal has long given way to a spiritual monarchy of the Latin type, or a decrepit survival of Greek hierarchy; while Protestantism tends to render it invisible, or merges it in the more powerful action of the Civil Power; or, it may be, proclaims it surpassed by a dreamy unity of philosophic speculators, which takes no account of 'the feeble things of this world,' of the poor and the uneducated, of women and children, thereby contrasting sharply with the Gospel, and betraying shrewd features of the 'knowledge that puffeth up.' (1 Cor. viii. 1.)

It is a feeling of the necessity of Unity in the enunciation of Christian Doctrine that has been the fruitful parent of multiplied Creeds and Symbolical books; and although I cannot allow of the Jesuit Petavius's assertion that Scripture itself is not otherwise the Rule of Faith than as it speaks and pronounces with the interpretation of lawful authority, § because Scripture is in itself the Rule antecedently to such

\* Eph. iv. 11, 12.

† Eph. iv. 14, 15.

‡ Tit. i. 9.

§ Petavius, *Dogmata Theologica*, Tom. I. c. 1. §. 10.

interpretation; yet the position is not altogether incorrect. For if the liberty of setting forth expositions of Scripture be granted without reserve, it will follow either that confusion subversive of all order and unity must attend it, or that the consciences of the less resolute and bold shall be securely trampled upon, and so liberty be submerged in the overflowings of licentiousness.

I assert then that the Divinely ordained remedy against such disastrous contingencies is the Authority of the Church in its judicial and testimonial relations. With the judicial authority of the Church I am not at present concerned; but must express my regret that such a verse of Scripture as that in S. Matthew, chap. xviii. v. 17, should have been injudiciously applied to establish the Church's authority in controversies of the Faith. Such crude dealing with the text of Scripture and shifting to the account of doctrine what so clearly belongs to discipline has supplied a weapon to the Latitudinarian for assailing the Church's authority altogether in matters of doctrine.\* Our business lies with the Authority of the Church in its traditional and *testimonial* aspect; by which I mean "that which consisteth in *testifying* the faith once delivered," not one that *creates* that which never was of force before. (Thorndike, Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 562.) They who maintain the sentence of the *present* Church to be the reason of believing *must abandon tradition*. And I am far from denying, that as the provinces of Doctrine and Discipline are most closely connected and frequently overlap each other, so the functions of the Church as a witness and keeper of the truth not infrequently are converted by the force of circumstances into those of a judge. For seeing that the Ministers of the Church are intrusted with the power of the keys and the dispensation of the Sacraments, and that the profession of orthodox belief hath ever been the *tessera* or token whereby Christians could claim their corporate rights in the Church, it naturally follows that excommunication or the exclusion from participation in the Sacraments should be the punishment awarded to such as failed to symbolize with the general Body: for without the credentials of orthodoxy the

\* See Limborch, Theol. Christiana, L. i. c. 10.



Sacraments of the Church would be robbed of their value, and their character as seals of Faith and pledges of Unity be virtually annulled. Hence, in a healthy condition of the Church, any flagrant departure from the line prescribed by her tradition calls for the exercise of her strictly judicial functions in the department of discipline. But this, as I have endeavoured to point out, is a consequence arising from a recognition of the corporate relations of individual Christians to one another as members of the Catholic Church.

I propose then 1. to examine the testimonial Authority of the Church in matters of doctrine, which I would term Catholic Tradition in general, whether written or unwritten; 2. to remark on the force of this testimony as it relates to Scripture; 3. to inquire into the meaning of Apostolical traditions so-called, and the weight to be attached to them; 4. to review the various expressions of Catholic Tradition as exhibited *α.* in the Creeds, *β.* in Liturgies, *γ.* in the oral teaching of the Universal Episcopate, *δ.* in General and Provincial Councils, *ε.* in the written works of the Fathers or such as have been stamped with the public approbation of the Church; and, lastly, to show that the above claims to prescriptive authority are not to be so stringently pressed as to supersede the concurrent authority of the existing Church and the theological labours of later expositors.

Of the existence of a general Ecclesiastical standard of interpretation of doctrine, termed tradition.

§. 2. That the Doctrines of the Faith must have found some common expression which the primitive converts might mutually recognise, even before the Divine Spirit had sealed them in perpetuity, is evident from Scripture itself. S. Paul writes to the Thessalonians, "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle."<sup>b</sup> And lest we should suppose that these *traditions* refer simply to Church customs and matters of discipline, he says further to Timothy, "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in CHRIST JESUS."<sup>c</sup> If the first Christians received the Gospel by oral delivery, the written monuments would be found in accordance with the doctrine which they had originally received. And as the design of the Sacred Writers was to fix the

<sup>b</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 15.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Tim. i. 13.

saving Truths, which at first were permitted to float at large in the Church, the province of Oral Tradition in the absolute preservation of those truths would appear to terminate when the Apostolic Writings could be fairly known and studied. It would then be confined to the interpretation and application of the Sacred Canon; for it is absurd to suppose that the Sacred Truths were dealt at random to persons incapable of perceiving their just relations and harmony. S. Paul distinctly implies the existence of such knowledge in the persons whom he addresses; "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say."<sup>d</sup> "Let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith."<sup>e</sup>

Tradition then is defined to be "Sacred Doctrine, accepted orally in the first instance, and confirmed by the use of the Faithful."<sup>f</sup> Origen witnesses to the existence of a universal Ecclesiastical Tradition guarding the sense of Scripture, in these words: "Whereas there are many who think that they perceive the things of CHRIST, and some of them think differently from those who went before them, let the preaching of the Church handed down from the Apostles by the order of succession and remaining in the churches even to the present time be preserved; that alone is to be believed, which is in accordance with ecclesiastical tradition."<sup>g</sup> But as time went on, the substance of this Ecclesiastical preaching and oral tradition naturally found expression in Creeds, Liturgies, the enactments of Councils, and the writings of Divines who obtained an extensive following in the Church.

The earliest instance which I find, where the specific channels of Catholic Tradition are enumerated, is in a petition presented by the deacon Basil to the Third General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. And as it is important to mark the beginnings of what has since been the general practice of the Church, I here subjoin it. "Among God's gifts," it says, "is true knowledge, and the hatred of knowledge falsely so-called; so that we should acknowledge the Faith delivered to the Catholic Church from the beginning

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. x. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. xii. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Dominicus Bannes, In Secun-

dam Secundæ S. Tho. qu. 1. Art. x. T. III. p. 168.

<sup>g</sup> Peri Archon in Proem. *circ. inst.*

by the Apostles and Martyrs and Confessors and holy Bishops, with the co-operation also of most pious Emperors; first by Peter the Apostle, the president, (of the College of Apostles,) <sup>h</sup> that said according to revelation on behalf of those that came after, 'Thou art the CHRIST, the SON of the LIVING GOD;' by James Apostle and Archbishop, by John Apostle and Evangelist, and the other Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, and all that have believed and that do believe in the consubstantial Trinity; by Irenæus, by Gregory bishop of Neocæsarea; by the holy Synod assembled at Antioch against Paul of Samosata, by the great and holy Synod of bishops at Nice; by Basil and Gregory, bishops; by Athanasius bishop of Alexandria; by Ephraim the Syrian; by Gregory, Ammon, Vitalius, Amphilocheus, Paulus, Antiochus, Eustathius, Methodius, Optimus, Leporius, Ambrose of Milan; by the whole Synod in Africa; by John,<sup>1</sup> Severian, Atticus bishop, by Cyril the bishop of Alexandria now alive and who follows the law of our religion."<sup>j</sup>

I have stated that upon the completion and publication of the Sacred Canon of Scripture the province of Catholic Tradition in matters of Faith is limited to the interpretation of the same. No writer so clearly asserts this, as the celebrated Vincentius of Lerins, who is prominent as a champion of Tradition. How, he asks, amidst the multiplied forms of novelty and error, how are Catholic men and sons of Mother Church to "discern truth from falsehood in the Holy Scriptures? Well, they shall earnestly strive to interpret the Divine Canon according to the traditions of the universal Church, and by the rules of Catholic dogma; in which Catholic and Apostolic Church they must needs follow universality, antiquity, consent."<sup>k</sup> He guards carefully against being supposed for an instant to put Scripture and Tradition on a par, or to regard them as two equal elements forming one Rule of Faith: "We have said above that this ever hath been and is to this day the custom of Catholics, to prove the true Faith by these two means; first by the authority of the

<sup>h</sup> τοῦ πρωτοστότου.

<sup>i</sup> Chrysostom.

<sup>j</sup> Conc. Ephes. Part I. ap. Labbe. T. III. p. 426.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. xxvii.

Divine Canon, then by the tradition of the Catholic Church. *Not that the Canon alone is not self-sufficient for all purposes; but because many persons interpreting the Divine Words according to their own judgment conceive various errors, therefore it is necessary that the understanding of the Scripture be applied to the one rule of ecclesiastical meaning, in those questions however chiefly on which rest the foundations of the entire Catholic dogma.*"<sup>1</sup> Thorndike prefers Tradition of the *whole Church*, which may be evident, though that of the *present Church* fail: an argument for that Unity of the Church which should be, and so save private Christians the resolution of disputes, "the reasons whereof they are not able to manage." (Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 559.) Vincentius bids us prefer antiquity to novelty; and in antiquity prefer the decrees of a universal Council to those of a few; and in the next place, the sentiments of many and great teachers agreeing with each other."<sup>m</sup> It will be seen that this famous Rule labours under the disadvantage of presupposing knowledge and opportunities quite exceptional.

This consent of Antiquity he declares to be not requisite in all cases, only in those cardinal dogmas which regulate the Faith: "Which ancient consent of the holy Fathers is to be followed by us not in all questions of the Divine Law, but principally in the rule of faith."<sup>n</sup>

When we inquire about the conditions of our recourse to this testimonial authority of Catholic Tradition and Consent, we may be surprised to discover that its aid is to be invoked not so much for the conviction of inveterate errors, as for the excision of heresy in its early stages. The sole authority of the Written Word is the enduring witness against heretics, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear; and the past action of Catholic Bishops or Councils in excluding them from the sacraments of the Church is also irreversible in its operation, so long as they adhere to their errors. It may be even said to supersede the necessity of argument, as S. Paul saith, "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted

<sup>1</sup> Vincentius Lirinensis, *Commo-*  
*nitorium*, c. xxix.

<sup>m</sup> *Ib.* c. xxvii.

<sup>n</sup> *Ib.* c. xxviii.

and sinneth, being condemned of himself."° Vincentius says, "But neither are all heresies to be impugned at all times nor in this manner, but recent ones only, when they first arise, whilst they are debarred by the short space of time from falsifying the rules of the old faith, before that by the further spread of the poison they endeavour to vitiate the records of the elders. But inveterate heresies are by no means to be met in this way, because in the long tract of times opportunities of enjoying the truth have been open to them. And therefore those more ancient schisms or heresies we must either convict by the sole authority of the Scriptures, or at least avoid them being condemned now of old by universal Councils of Catholic Bishops."ª

In exact accordance (in theory at least) with this teaching concerning Catholic Tradition, as a codicil appendent to the Sacred Canon, is the injunction agreed upon by Archbishop Parker and the Upper House of Convocation, A.D. 1571. "In the first place they (the preachers) shall see that they never teach anything for their sermon, which they would have to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected out of that very doctrine."ª I feel bound to caution the reader against a blind reliance on Vincentius's Rule. The 'quod ab omnibus' would, in the ante-Nicene centuries, cover a belief in a carnal Millennium, in the Quaker tenet of the unlawfulness of bearing arms, and in the Nonjuring doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance. I commend the last to those who cite Bishop Ken's Profession of Faith. It governs his meaning.

§. 3. If Scripture may be figuratively represented as a magnificent and august temple gleaming with pictured lights, attracting the beholder by its orient splendours, and at the same time sobering his imagination by its contrasts of mysterious shadows, I would assign to Tradition the position of a stately buttress external and subsidiary to the building, not that of an inner and retired sanctuary consecrated to the use

Of the relations of Scripture and Tradition.

° Titus iii. 10, 11.

ª *Ib.* c. xxviii.

ª Wilkins' Concilia, Tom. IV. p. 267.

of a select hierarchy and impervious to the visits of the unprivileged multitude. The Scripture is historically disclosed to our eyes, guarded and fenced by the uniform sense and tradition of those who were originally privileged to receive it. Thus Tertullian: "Who shall determine between us unless the reason of time, prescribing authority for that which shall be found more ancient, and presuming wrong in that which shall be proved later? For so far as falsehood is a corruption of truth, truth must needs precede it. \* \* \* In sum, if it is agreed that that is the truer which is before, that before which is from the beginning, and that from the Apostles; it will be doubtless equally agreed, that that has been handed down from the Apostles which has been held sacred in their churches. Let us see what milk the Corinthians drank from Paul; according to what rule the Galatians were corrected; what the Philippians, Thessalonians, Ephesians do read; what also the Romans in our immediate neighbourhood re-echo, to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel even sealed with their blood. We have also churches the nurslings of John. For although Marcion rejects his Apocalypse, the order of Bishops however reckoned back to its origin will stop at John as its author. So also is the genuineness of the rest recognised."<sup>r</sup>

In another treatise he expounds the principle which directs the application of the term Apostolical to the Churches of later foundation: "They (the Apostles) founded Churches in every city; from which the other Churches successively borrowed the graft of faith and seeds of doctrine, and do daily borrow so as to become Churches; and hereby they themselves also are considered Apostolic, as the offspring of Apostolical Churches. Every kind must needs be reckoned up to its origin. Therefore so many and so great Churches form that original Church of the Apostles, from which all proceed. So all are that original (Church), and (all) are Apostolic, while uniformly all approve unity; while they have communion of peace and the appellation of brotherhood and the binding pledge of hospitality: which rights no other reason regulates but the one tradition of the same sacrament.

<sup>r</sup> Tert. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. capp. 4, 5. p. 415.

Hence then we rule it, that if our LORD JESUS CHRIST sent Apostles to preach, other preachers are not to be received save those whom He appointed; nor doth He appear to have revealed to other than the Apostles whom He sent to preach. But what they preached by revelation of CHRIST, I will here determine, ought not otherwise to be proved save through the same Churches which they founded, by preaching as well as by their Epistles afterwards. If this is so, it is agreed henceforth that all doctrine is to be reckoned true, which conspires with those Apostolical mother Churches and originals of the faith, and holds what they received from the Apostles, the Apostles from CHRIST, CHRIST from GOD; but that all doctrine is to be presumed false, which savoureth not the truth of the Churches and of the Apostles and of CHRIST and of GOD.”<sup>a</sup>

The mode of procedure laid down by S. Augustine for him who would diligently search the Scriptures implies that the authority of the Catholic Churches is testimonial in its character and influenced by local and prescriptive considerations. “In reading the Canonical Scriptures,” he writes, “let him follow the authority of as many Catholic Churches as possible, among which certainly let those be which have been granted Apostolic Sees and have received Epistles. He shall therefore observe this measure in Canonical Scriptures, so as to prefer those which are received by all Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive: but among those which are not received by all, let him prefer those which the more numerous and graver receive to those maintained by the fewer Churches of less authority. But if he should find some to be held by the more numerous, others by those of greater weight, although he cannot easily find this, yet I think they should be held of equal authority.”<sup>b</sup>

Nor is this testimonial and *hermeneutical* Tradition as it were a kind of Apostolic afterthought bequeathed to the Church in order to remedy the obscurity of Scripture. Rather it may be likened to the genuine reflection of the Sacred Lamp, as it streams down on unalloyed and purest mirrors.

<sup>a</sup> Tert. De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, capp. 20, 21.

<sup>b</sup> S. Aug. De Doctrina Christiana, Lib. ii. c. 8, Tom. III. p. 23.

Separate it from the substance which it represents, and it ceases. Tradition is the response of the myriad-hearts of the Catholic Church to the voices of Scriptures; and its recognised expressions in Creeds, Liturgies, Decrees of Councils, and *dicta* of Fathers are but its emphatic, or authoritative, or successful enunciations. So Augustine, interpreting a passage in Genesis, says; "Although we have been unable to sift the meaning of the author of this book, we have not however departed from the Rule of Faith, which is sufficiently known to the faithful *through other sacred writings of the same authority.*"<sup>a</sup> And Pope Felix III., in his Synodal letter to the people of Antioch, containing the excommunication of their Patriarch Peter Gnapheus, (A.D. 446,) says; "Disciples of CHRIST but my sons, guard the traditions, which ye have received from the Divine Scriptures."<sup>v</sup>

§. 4. Having said this much concerning Tradition, that it is the nearest approach towards an adequate expression of the mind of the Catholic Church wherewith it understands and interprets Scripture, let us examine whether there be any tangible forms of Tradition, which can be proved beyond mere presumption to have descended from the Apostles themselves, and that with anything approaching the sanctions which attend Canonical Scripture. If there be such, we naturally expect to meet them in the earliest Christian records subsequent to the Apostolic age. Of the five Apostolical Fathers, Barnabas, Hermas, and Clement form a connecting link with the Sacred Canon. But I think I may safely affirm that while the style and matter of S. Barnabas' Epistle reminds us of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the visions and similitudes of S. Hermas recall those of the Second Book of Esdras, there is nothing in those writings which commends itself as authoritative,—nothing which is not already expressed or implied in Canonical Scripture. In the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, the Unity of the Church and the Apostolic powers granted to the Episcopate for the preservation of that Unity, become more prominent, as the influence of the Apostles, the first Founders of the Churches,

Examination  
of special  
(so-called)  
Apostolic  
Traditions.

<sup>a</sup> De Civitate Dei, L. xi. c. 33.  
T. VII. p. 298.

<sup>v</sup> Labbe, T. IV. p. 1069.



is weakened by their removal from the scene. Yet no doctrinal fact, over and above the hints and examples of Scripture, can be discovered. If the analogies between portions of the Old and New Covenants, their Sacrifices and Hierarchies, be insisted upon with a larger illustration than it came within the scope of the Sacred Writers to adopt, it doth not appear that any new doctrine was added to the original deposit. For, admitting that the Aaronical Sacrifice and Priesthood derived their efficacy (so far as it extended) from the future action of the MESSIAH, and that the virtue of the Christian 'Ministry of Reconciliation' depends on the perpetual impetration of spiritual blessings from the "showing forth of His death until He come again," it is clear that an analogy between the two facts will have been already established; and the tracing of the minute approaches of the analogy will be a mere matter of detail, unworthy of the pretension of an independent and substantive Tradition.

I pass by Justin Martyr and the Apologists, as the purpose of their writing was inconsistent with any development of esoteric Tradition, and come to S. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons. If there be anything like a promise of knowledge supplemental to Scripture—something that goes beyond the interpretation of Scripture or a record of Church discipline, it is a statement of the bliss of the Millennium, tricked out with portentous adjuncts more suited to the luxuriant fancy of Arabian tales than to the sober and spiritual judgment of the Catholic Church.\* I will not repeat the words of Irenæus; and prefer supposing that his reverence for Papias, a hearer of S. John and companion of Polycarp, who had probably picked up the thought from Judaizing Christians, induced him in that instance to depart from the grave character which distinguishes his writings.

We come next to Clement of Alexandria, a man of polished learning and extensive intercourse with the Christian circles of his time; whose writings are happily preserved to illustrate a period not so far removed from the Apostolic age as to render its transactions a mere matter of speculation, yet

\* Adv. Hæreses, Lib. v. cap. 33.

enough to make Christians feel they were borne along the waves of Time away from the sight of its sacred horizon. What his opportunities of learning notices of the Apostles were, may be stated in his own words. In composing his *Stromateis*, he says, that he treasured up "memorials for (his) old age, truly a sketch to remedy oblivion, and an outline of those clear and living words which I was privileged to hear, and of those blessed men and really worthy of account. Of these, one was in Greece, Ionicus; others in Magna Græcia; another of them was of Cœle Syria, another from Egypt, others in the East; and of the (latter,) one was from Assyria, the other, in Palestine, was a Hebrew by origin. But when I met with the last (in ability he was first) I resided in Egypt, exploring what was forgotten. A Sicilian bee, in truth, gathering the flowers of the Prophetic and Apostolic meadow, he begat in the souls of the hearers an unalloyed stock of knowledge. But they, preserving the true tradition of the blessed doctrine, straight from Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, the holy Apostles, receiving it son from father (but few are those who are like their fathers,) came however, GOD willing, even to us, to deposit those ancestral and Apostolic seeds."<sup>\*</sup>

It may be seen even from this enumeration of the teachers who transmitted Apostolic traditions, that the chiefest and ablest of them is still represented as hovering about the Prophetic and Apostolic Writings. No trace appears of any Unwritten Tradition, co-ordinate in dignity with Holy Scripture, and claiming to share along with it our divided allegiance. If we take Clement's case as a sample of what a man might glean in the way of Apostolic Traditions, over and above the Sacred Canon, the harvest shrinks to a few samples of sayings and doings of the Apostles. To afford proof of this assertion, I will merely indicate the passages where Clement speaks of the Apostle S. Philip as having daughters, and giving them in marriage;<sup>†</sup> where he mentions Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, as having died without the oral confession of CHRIST in Martyrdom;<sup>‡</sup> and where he preserves the touching story of S. Peter's bidding his wife, as she was being led

<sup>\*</sup> S. Clem. Alex. *Stromat. Lib. i. circa initium*, p. 201.

<sup>†</sup> *Strom. L. iii. p. 327.*

<sup>‡</sup> *Strom. L. iv. p. 366.*

away to martyrdom, "Remember the LORD."<sup>a</sup> The sayings indeed of the Apostles would be more important towards the settlement of the present question, if it could be shown that any doctrine is inculcated or any mystery revealed which is not found already in the Canonical Scripture. In illustration of this point I will cite three passages to show that such traditional sayings convey no teaching beyond the admissions of common reason or the statements of Scripture.

Thus Clement: "The philosopher loves truth from his being a genuine servant, and already considered a friend on account of his attachment. But the beginning of it is to admire things, as Plato saith in the Theaetetus; and Matthias in the Traditions recommends this, saying, 'Admire the present,' (*θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα*;) putting it as a first step to further knowledge."<sup>b</sup> Here we have merely a pithy sentence embracing the doctrine of Natural Religion, as taught in the Acts,<sup>c</sup> "Nevertheless, He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." Again, Clement quotes a saying of S. Matthias to this effect, that, "If the elect's neighbour hath sinned, the elect hath sinned; for had he so conducted himself as reason suggests, his neighbour would have so respected his manner of life as not to have sinned."<sup>d</sup> This also is but an echo of S. Paul's saying, "But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against CHRIST."<sup>e</sup> Lastly, a saying of Nicolas the Deacon is preserved, that "we should abuse the flesh" (*δεῖν παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκί*); as Clement expounds his meaning, "we should beat down pleasures and desires, and by this exercise wither the impulses and assaults of the flesh."<sup>f</sup> But this is supported by S. Paul, saying, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."<sup>g</sup>

Consequently upon these and similar evidences, I affirm that there are no special Apostolic traditions propounded for

<sup>a</sup> Strom. L. vii. p. 529.

<sup>b</sup> Strom L. ii. p. 278.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xiv. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Strom. L. vii. p. 537.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Strom. L. ii. p. 201.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 27.

our acceptance as matter of Faith, none that are not either already contained in Holy Scripture, or human deductions in harmony with its contents, or pious usages resting on immemorial prescription. The erroneous holding or the rejection of such Traditions are not directly sins against the Faith; but in the way of consequence they *do* induce a habit of mind in communities and individuals, which disposes them to tamper with or to reject what is matter of Faith. For example, the Commemoration of the Faithful Departed and Prayer for them in the Oblation of the Eucharist is neither enjoined nor even mentioned in Holy Scripture; and therefore it neither can be matter of Faith nor be considered necessary to salvation. But it doth not thence strictly follow that the wilful and unqualified rejection of a practice enjoined by the Universal Church and witnessed to by all antiquity, is in itself innocent or indifferent, and that it may not entail the heavy penalty of weakening the faculty of the soul for the reception of matters of Faith.

Again, the perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Mary is not of necessity inferred from the exact words of Scripture; but it hath ever found a response in every Catholic heart, and is more in harmony with Scripture, and more conducive to the reverence due to Her who gave birth to GOD (τῇ Θεοτόκῃ.) The necessary condition of the Divine Incarnation would be sufficiently maintained even if we allowed that Mary became subsequently a mother by lawful wedlock; nor does S. Basil scruple to acknowledge it. “‘He knew her not,’” saith he, quoting S. Matthew, “‘till she had brought forth her first-born Son.’”<sup>b</sup> But this now affords a suspicion, that after she had purely ministered to the birth of the LORD, that was accomplished through the HOLY SPIRIT, Mary did not deny the usual rights of marriage: but even though no bye-injury be done to the account of piety, (for as far as her ministry according to the Dispensation is concerned her Virginity is necessary,) still, because the ear of Christians will not endure, that ever the parent of GOD ceased to be Virgin, we consider those testimonies sufficient.”<sup>c</sup> And even the Protestant Chamier admits the doctrine of the Ever-Virginity on similar

<sup>b</sup> S. Matth. i. 25.

<sup>c</sup> S. Basil, Hom. xxv. T. I. p. 590.

grounds: "We therefore willingly embrace that sentiment, which appears to have already from the beginning prevailed among Christians, that she was a Virgin, that is, pure from the connection of her husband, not only in the whole mystery of CHRIST's generation, which certainly it is necessary that we should believe, but also in the whole time of her after-life. And we disapprove of those who teach contrariwise, whether Helvidius, or Jovinian, or the Antidico-Marianitæ. For in these things, which are not properly *de fide*, we say that the authority of the Church is great, if it neither contradicts Scripture nor advances an absurdity."<sup>1</sup>

In order to prefix a splendid title to the commonplace of Apostolic Traditions, Duns Scotus would needs reckon among them the article in the Creed touching CHRIST's Descent into Hell. But this would rather seem precisely to come within the scope of my former assertion, and to resolve itself into a truth virtually contained in Holy Scripture, or a human deduction in harmony with its contents. Indeed, many would consider the article explicitly taught by S. Paul in the passage: "Wherefore he saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now, that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?"<sup>2</sup> But I will repeat Scotus' words, as they form an apt transition to the concluding portion of my division of Apostolical Traditions, namely, pious usages resting on the immemorial prescription of the Catholic Church. "That CHRIST descended into Hell is not taught in the Gospel, and yet it is to be held as an article of the Faith, because it is put in the Apostles' Creed. And it would be dangerous to err concerning those things which not only descend from the Apostles in writing, but also are held through the custom of the Universal Church. Nor hath CHRIST taught in the Gospel all things pertaining to the dispensation of the Sacraments. For He said to His disciples, 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the SPIRIT of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth.'<sup>3</sup> Many things, then, the

<sup>1</sup> Chamierci Panstratia, T. I. p. 303.

<sup>2</sup> Eph. iv. 8, 9.

<sup>3</sup> S. John xvi. 12, 13.

HOLY SPIRIT taught them, which are not written in the Gospel; and those many things, some they passed on through writing, some through custom. In like manner, divers Creeds were put forth at different times against different heresies as they arose, because it was necessary to declare the truth to which that heresy was opposed; which truth, even though it were before *de fide*, was not previously so much exhibited as then (it was) against the error of those who denied it.”<sup>m</sup>

In treating of the last division of Apostolical Traditions, I will content myself with observing, once for all, that Church customs termed Apostolical never seem to rise above the region of *probability*; that sometimes their universal occurrence appears to form the ground for presuming them to have been of Apostolical origin; but that, however in an intellectual point of view they may lack historical evidence, morally and practically they possess ample claims on our reverence and continued acceptance. For they are covered by S. Paul’s pithy argument, “But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God.”<sup>n</sup>

To give specimens of such customs; the Author of Questions and Answers to the Orthodox refers the rite of standing in prayer on LORD’S Days to an Apostolic origin. “The not kneeling on the LORD’S Day is a symbol of the Resurrection. But such custom began in Apostolic times, as saith the blessed Irenæus the Martyr and Bishop of Lyons in the book concerning Easter; wherein he hath made mention also concerning Pentecost, in which we do not bend the knee, since it is equivalent to the LORD’S Day, for the reason mentioned by him.”<sup>o</sup> In answer to such as would insist on written authority, Tertullian urges the fact of the general acceptance of unwritten customs and traditions: “Let us then inquire whether no tradition, save written, ought to be received? Plainly we will grant it, if no examples of other observances prejudice the case, which we vindicate without a written instrument by the title of tradition alone, and consequently by the patronage of custom. To begin with baptism; when we

<sup>m</sup> Scotus, Lib. I. Dist. xi. qu. 1.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 16.

<sup>o</sup> Quæst. et Respons. ad Ortho-

dox. ap. S. Justini Mart. Opp. p. 468.

are going to enter into the water, there and then in church under the Chief Minister's hand (*sub antistitis manu*) we protest that we renounce the devil, and his pomp, and his angels; then we are dipped three times, making a somewhat fuller answer than the LORD hath marked out in the Gospel. Then on being taken up out of the water, we taste a mixture of milk and honey; and from that day throughout a whole week we abstain from our daily bath. The Sacrament of the Eucharist, ordered by the LORD both at meal-time and to all persons, we also receive in our assemblies before dawn, and from the hand of none other than of the Presidents. We make oblations for the dead on the anniversary day as their birthday falls. We think fasting on the LORD's Day abominable, or to worship kneeling. We rejoice in the same immunity from Easter until Pentecost. It is with anxiety that we suffer aught of the Cup or even the Bread to fall to the ground. At every progress and motion, at coming in and going out, at putting on our shoes, at bathing, at meals, at kindling lights, at going to bed, at sitting down, whatever our employment, we impress the forehead with the sign of the cross. Of these and such other points of discipline, if you demand the law of Scriptures, you shall find none; tradition shall be pleaded as the author of them, custom the confirmer, and faith the observer. Meanwhile you believe that there is some reason, to which obedience may be due." <sup>p</sup>

S. Basil, in his enumeration of unwritten traditions, is even yet more explicit: "Of the dogmas preserved in the Church, some we have from written teaching, others from the tradition of the Apostles, delivered to us in silence. Both classes have the same force with respect to piety. For if we were to endeavour to reject unwritten customs as of no importance, we should imperceptibly rob the Gospel of what is so. For example, to mention the commonest thing,—Who is it that hath taught us by writing to mark with the sign of the Cross those that have believed in the Name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST? What writing hath taught us to turn to the East in prayer? Which of the saints hath left us in writing the words of the Invocation upon the exhibition of the Bread

<sup>p</sup> Tert. De Corona, cap. 3. p. 102.

of the Eucharist and of the Cup of Blessing? For certainly we do not content ourselves with that which the Apostle or the Gospel have mentioned, but we both say before and after other things, as possessing great influence with respect to the mystery, having received them from unwritten teaching. And we bless the water of baptism, and the oil of unction, and the baptized person himself. From what written directions? Is it not from reserved (*σιωπωμένης*) and mystic tradition? But what of the anointing with oil itself? What written discourse hath taught it? And the thrice dipping the person, whence comes it? And other such rites as belong to Baptism: the renouncing Satan and his angels,—from what Scripture is it? Is it not from this unpublished and secret teaching, which our fathers quietly preserved, having been well taught to maintain the solemn mysteries in silence.”<sup>a</sup>

Basil assigns a reason for this secret tradition, which can hardly be accepted in our days. It is, “lest the knowledge of doctrines having been studied threadbare (*καταμελετηθείσαν*) should become contemptible to the many, owing to habit.”<sup>r</sup> We may conceive that Christian teachers might be careful in public, how they dwelt on the highest mysteries of Faith before a mixed audience; it may be urged that, the copies of the Sacred Books being in manuscript, and guarded by the jealous care of the Early Church, the Written Word could not be so exposed to the rude handling of the scoffer and blasphemer as it has been in later times; that under such circumstances the light and shade of Scripture Revelation and Unwritten Tradition might be harmoniously blended in the one Catholic system. Waiving the presumption of its Apostolical origin, the jealous and reserved temper of the East, the profane levity which so generally marked the Gentile populations, and the necessity of caution in days of persecution, will sufficiently explain the grounds of that Discipline of the Secret, which existed in Primitive times. We may trace its operation in the imperfect apprehension of dogma which marks the writings of laymen or catechumens, such as Lactantius and Arnobius; and in the impulse given to the

<sup>a</sup> S. Basil, De Sancto Spiritu, cap. 27, Opp. T. II. pp. 210, 211.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.*



hyper-mystical school of exegesis, as exemplified in Origen. But whatever may have been its recommendations in the outset of Christianity, as time went on, they were sure to lose their force and cogency. As soon as a system of reserve found its vindicators and expounders, in the very action of its champions it suffered extinction. It might retard one sad effect of the Gospel, that it should be "to them that perish, the savour of death unto death;" but it could not entirely prevent it. Heretics still separated from the Church, as Simon Magus did in the days of the Apostles, "that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of (the elect);"<sup>1</sup> but they carried out with them what they listed of the doctrinal and ritual tradition of the Church. The Scripture might be guarded with affectionate solicitude; but a single copy would suffice to expose its pearls to the irreverent treatment of a Porphyry. The ritual, which with its incense-cloud of beautiful solemnities shrouded the celebration of the sacred Mysteries, might be secured for a while by the oral transmission of a line of hierarchs; but when its provisions had been once committed to writing, what authority could undertake to prescribe, with any hope of success, the nature and extent of criticism which it might receive? The spiritualism of Origen, which tended to rob Scripture of its historical character, provoked a re-action in the rationalism of Theodore of Mopsuestia; and the tendency to lower the spiritual meaning of Scripture was perpetuated by the wide extension of Nestorianism. The outbreak of profaneness which attended the progress of the Arian controversy may induce some to think well of a system of reserve, which seems to promise immunity from such disasters; but such a system was impracticable, when the world had nominally become Christian; and if its practicability be impaired, the reason of its existence will have ceased.

Before I quit this subject, I will adduce a few clear instances to prove my assertion, that Church customs have been dignified with the name of Apostolical Traditions, without any positive evidence of an Apostolic parentage. Thus S. Leo attributes the exemption of the Clergy from the performance of public

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> 1 S. John ii. 19.

penance to Apostolic tradition : " It is alien to ecclesiastical usage, that those who have been consecrated presbyters or deacons should for any crime of theirs receive the remedy of penance by the imposition of hands : which thing doubtless hath descended from Apostolical tradition, according as it is written, ' If a priest<sup>u</sup> sin against the LORD, who shall intreat for him ? ' " Whence to gain GOD's mercy a private retirement should be sought by lapsed persons of this kind ; where if their satisfaction shall have been worthy, let it also be profitable to them." <sup>w</sup> Pope Vigilius, writing to the Emperor Justinian, (A. D. 538,) speaks of the prayer for the protection of the Catholic Faith, which occurs during the celebration of the Eucharist, as proceeding from ancient tradition ; <sup>x</sup> and in his letter to Eutherius, he attributes the Prayer of Consecration or *Canon Missæ* to Apostolical tradition ; evidently, because it was according to the usual order of the Church. Thus : " As often as the festival of Easter or of the Ascension or of Pentecost and the Epiphany and of the Saints is celebrated, we subjoin single texts suitable to the days when we commemorate a holy solemnity or those whose birthday we celebrate ; the rest we prosecute in the accustomed order. Wherefore we have directed also the text (added below) of the Canonical Prayer itself, which by GOD's favour we have received from Apostolical tradition." <sup>y</sup>

That many rites commonly received by the Church were in a popular sense termed Apostolical, is seen hereby, that Gregory the Great distinctly contradicts the above statement of his predecessor touching the Apostolical origin of the *Canon Missæ*. He writes ; " But we say the LORD's Prayer soon after the Prayer [of Consecration] (*post precem*) on that ground ; because it was the manner of the Apostles to consecrate the Host of the Oblation with the LORD's Prayer only. And it seemed to me very inconvenient to say over the Oblation a prayer which a scholar had composed, (*precem quam*

<sup>u</sup> S. Leo adapts the passage to the case in hand, and writes *sacerdos*.

<sup>v</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 25.

<sup>w</sup> S. Leo, Ep. 92, *ap.* Labbe, Tom. III. p. 1406.

<sup>x</sup> " Quod omnes pontifices antiqua in offerendo sacrificia traditione

deposcimus, exorantes ut Catholicam fidem adunare, regere Dominus, et custodire toto orbe dignetur." Vigilius P.P. Ep. 4, *ap.* Labbe, T. V. p. 315.

<sup>y</sup> Labbe, T. V. p. 313.

*scholasticus composuerat,')* and refrain from uttering over His Body and Blood the very tradition which our Redeemer hath composed." \* In conclusion, I would say with S. Augustine; "In those things concerning which Divine Scripture hath determined nothing certain, the custom of the people of God and the institutions of our ancestors should be held for law." \*

Expressions  
of Church  
Authority  
and Tradition:  
first,  
in Creeds.

§. 5. Assuming henceforth that there is no deposit of Apostolic Tradition beyond what is revealed in Holy Scripture, and that what hath generally been termed Tradition is to be found in immemorial custom or in the Divinely regulated harmony of doctrine in the Catholic Church, I will now proceed to review the expressions of the latter in the order which they seem naturally to assume. The first authoritative embodiment of doctrine, which a Christian would receive in the Primitive Church, was the Creed. In the Gallican Church we learn that Palm Sunday was specially devoted to the solemn delivery of it to the Catechumens. It was regarded as a breviary of the truths contained at large in Holy Scripture.<sup>b</sup> The Church never arrogated to herself to teach doctrines beyond Scripture; for "although she may have on earth the authority of God, yet she doth not exceed the limitation of Scripture."<sup>c</sup> "Wait," saith S. Cyril, "according to the proper season for the confirmation of its contents from the Divine Scriptures. For the articles of the Faith were not composed at random; but the most opportune matters collected out of Scripture complete (as) one the teaching of the Faith. And as the mustard seed contains in a small grain its many shoots, so also this Faith hath embraced in a few words the knowledge of piety in the Old and New (Testaments)."<sup>d</sup> And S. Leo in his epistle to Flavian urges against Eutyches the authority of the Creed as a summary of Scripture truth: "Not knowing then what he should think concerning the Incarnation of God's WORD, and not being willing to labour in the wide extent of the Divine Scriptures that he

\* S. Greg. P.P. I. in Registro, Epp. Lib. vii. Ep. 64, *ap.* Labbe, T. V. p. 1348.

\* S. Aug. Ep. 36 *ad Casulanum*. T. II. p. 68.

<sup>b</sup> See Mabillon, De Liturgia Gallicana, Lib. iii. p. 347.

<sup>c</sup> Durand. Lib. ii. Dist. 44, qu. 3, §. 9.

<sup>d</sup> S. Cyril. Hierosol. Cateches. v. §. 7. p. 76.

might become worthy of the light thence (proceeding), he ought at least to have paid very careful attention to that common and harmonious confession, which the whole multitude of the Faithful makes, that it believes in GOD the FATHER ALMIGHTY, and in CHRIST JESUS His Only-Begotten SON, Our LORD, Who was conceived of the HOLY GHOST and of Mary the Virgin."\* S. Irenæus long before understood the Creed in the same light: "He who holds firm the Rule of Truth, which he received in Baptism, will understand these names which are from the Scriptures, and sayings and parables."† Durandus follows this idea, saying, that "Above the sacred Scripture nothing should be added which is dissonant from it, in aught diminishing or corrupting it; but that may well be added, which hath to be more fully declared by it. Those things also which are contained in a scattered form in Scripture and are more necessary to be believed, it is useful to cull out of it for the easier instruction of the simple and against the craftiness of heretics: and so it hath been done by means of the Creed."‡ The Creed moreover contains the Word of God, *not the words* of Scripture, but *the sense and meaning of them*.

§. 6. When a Catechumen in the Primitive Church was being prepared for baptism, he found himself excluded from the Christian assembly during the celebration of the Eucharist. Nor does it appear that any full instruction was afforded him

Secondly, in  
Liturgies.

\* Labbe, Tom. IV. p. 346.

† S. Iren. adv. Hæreses, Lib. i. p. 41.

‡ Durand. Lib. iii. Dist. 25, qu. 3. §. 10. He supplies us also with the following beautiful specimen of symbolical teaching: "Since all the truth of the Faith is diffusely contained in sacred Scripture, and in very many places so obscurely, that in order to elicit clearly the truth long study is required, to which all cannot apply whom it concerns to know it; it was necessary to collect those things summarily from places of sacred Scripture, and propose them to all to be believed, lest the faith of the simple should be corrupted by heretics. But this was done in the three Creeds. First in

that of the Apostles; which was composed when the Truth had not yet been published, and therefore it is said in a low voice (*submissæ*). Secondly, in the Nicene Creed, for the sake of clearing the Truth against heretics; and therefore in a solemn Mass it is chaunted after the Gospel, wherein some most difficult points contained in the Apostles' Creed are more diffusely elucidated. But the third Creed was put forth at a time when the Truth had been assailed by heretics, yet was prevailing, namely, that of Athanasius; wherefore it is said when darkness is scarcely over, (that is, at Prime;) although that is rather by way of instruction than as a Creed." *Ibid.* §. 7, 8.

touching that and other Mysteries before he was baptized. Thus S. Cyril reserves for the 'newly-enlightened' or recently baptized (*πρὸς τοὺς νεοφωτιστοὺς*) his Mystagogical Lectures, wherein he delivers the teaching of the Church concerning Chrism and the Eucharist. This was done to prepare them for the reception of the chief Sacrament of the Gospel. When therefore a Christian was admitted to full Church privileges, the Liturgy or Form of their administration would appear to constitute next after the Creed another department of the testimonial office of the Church, coming home to his convictions under circumstances of unusual authority. Thus Pope S. Celestine argues on behalf of the doctrine of Grace from the ground of the common Prayers of the Church; feeling that there he could safely appeal to what all would recognise as the authoritative voice of the Church. "Let us refer," he says, "to the sacraments of priestly prayers, which being handed down from the Apostles are uniformly celebrated in every Catholic Church, that the law of supplication may determine the law of belief. For when the presidents of the holy congregations discharge the legation committed to them, they plead the cause of mankind before the Divine Mercy; and, the whole Church mingling its sighs with them, they pray, 'that the Faith may be granted to infidels, that idolaters may be delivered from the error of their impiety, that the veil having been removed from their heart the light of truth may appear to the Jews, that heretics may recover by the perception of the Catholic Faith, that schismatics may receive the spirit of reviving charity, that the remedy of penance may be conferred on the lapsed, that lastly to catechumens brought to the sacrament of Regeneration the court of heavenly grace may be opened.'"<sup>h</sup> And S. Epiphanius illustrates the Church's practice of praying for the dead from the known Liturgical Forms; "For we make mention of the righteous," he saith, "and of sinners. On behalf of sinners entreating for God's mercy; and on behalf of the righteous, the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, Anchorites, and all their com-

<sup>h</sup> *Auctoritates de Gratia Dei*, ap. Labbe, T. II. p. 1616.

pany, that we may separate the LORD JESUS CHRIST from the order of mere men by the honour we pay Him, and may render worship to Him; considering that the LORD is not to be matched with any man, though every man were righteous ten thousand times and more.”<sup>1</sup>

Renaudot has some good remarks on the value of Liturgies as indicating Church doctrine. “Very great in this kind is the simplicity of the Roman Canon, which is no light indication of its consummate antiquity; for it hath not those things which the Greeks and Orientals have piously added touching the Consubstantial, the Theotokos, and some other, and it is shorter than the Oriental forms. But in many Liturgies of the Western Rite, which follow the same Canon, much has been inserted to instruct the Faithful, in the Collects and in the Prefaces or Benedictions, which we read in the ancient copies of the Gothic Mass, the Gallican, the Ambrosian, the Mosarabic, or others. Of the dogmas of the Church which regard the TRINITY or the Incarnation, few things occur; because, since the heresies which attacked either point were extinguished, they hardly sprung up again in the West. One (Preface) alone is extant, which is even now used on the Feast of TRINITY, which formerly was celebrated under the name of the First LORD’s day in the Octave of Pentecost. In that Preface the faith of the TRINITY is more explicitly propounded. Of the rest few are found, because the Nestorian and Monophysite heresies spread in the East rather than in the West. But when in Africa and in the Gauls the Pelagian heresy had infected many, there occur in the Prayers very many passages, which teach the Faithful concerning their own weakness and the need of grace for every good work, and contain a summary of the doctrine promulgated by the Councils against the Pelagians and their remnants.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> S. Epiph. Hær. 75. T. I. p. 911.

<sup>2</sup> Renaudot. *Liturgie Orientales*. Tom. I. p. lv. Bishop Burnet’s testimony may be added. Speaking of the Ambrosian Liturgy, he says: “Here is the language of the whole Church of that time and in

the most important part of the Divine Office, which signifieth more to me than a thousand quotations out of particular writers, which are but their private opinions: but this is the voice of the whole body in its addresses to GOD.” Burnet’s *Letters from Italy*, p. 112.

Thirdly, in the oral teaching of the Catholic Episcopate.

§. 7. Admitted to the participation of the Sacred Mysteries, the Christian felt himself to be at last gathered to the one visible fold of the Catholic Church. He was brought to the laver of Baptism at Easter, to bring his regeneration to symbolize (God willing) with His LORD'S Risen Life; or at Pentecost, to mark the hoped-for descent of the HOLY GHOST; or at the Epiphany, that the Star of Bethlehem might dawn on his soul and lead him to JESUS, that the SAVIOUR might discourse with him as He had done with the doctors in the Temple, that the Redeemer might enrich the 'beggarly elements' of his nature by the infusion of His precious Blood as He had turned the water into wine at Cana in Galilee. It was the Bishop who in person baptized him, or at all events superintended the function when it devolved on a Presbyter; it was the Bishop who on his rising out of the baptistery impressed on his glistening brow the Sign of the Cross with consecrated ointment or *chrism*, in token of the good fight of Faith which the Christian wrestler was prepared to engage in, and in remembrance of the olive branch of peace which the Divine Dove would bring to him now safely lodged in the Ark of CHRIST'S Church. It was the Bishop who imparted to him his share of the universal Priesthood, by admitting him to the Communion of CHRIST'S Body and Blood. The Bishops were the successors of the Apostles in ordinary; and therefore it was natural to regard them (viewed collectively) as the representatives of the Church. Thus it came home to Origen to speak of "the general body of Bishops (*τὸ τῶν ἐπισκόπων σῶμα*) and their school" as worshipping CHRIST.\* And S. Vincent of Lerins exclaims, "Who is Timothy at this day except either generally the universal Church or specially the whole body of prelates, who ought either themselves to have or to infuse into others the entire knowledge of Divine worship?"<sup>1</sup> So Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, in his letter to the Synod of Ephesus, maintains that "the authority of the Apostolic See and the priestly vote harmoniously united (*εἰς ἐν συμφωνοῦσα ἡ ψῆφος ἡ ἱερατικὴ*) had choked" the heresies which assailed the Incarnation.<sup>m</sup> And in the same Synod,

\* Orig. *Contra Marcionitas*, §. 5. p. 160.

<sup>1</sup> Vinc. Lirin. *Comm.* c. 22; p. 349.

<sup>m</sup> Labbe, T. III. p. 351.

the Imperial Rescript of Theodosius and Valentinian declares it "unlawful (*ἀθέμιτον*) for anyone that is out of the catalogue of the most holy Bishops to meddle with ecclesiastical questions;"<sup>a</sup> meaning of course questions of doctrine.

Such were the grounds of that paramount authority which Bishops possessed in primitive times. They were regarded as summing up in their own persons the authority of the Church at large; their election by Clergy and People expressed the reality of their present claims; their confirmation by the Metropolitan and consecration by him and his com-provincial Bishops marked the cohesion of the entire Episcopate and the continued assertion of a retrospective tradition. But here we must pause. The course of Church history hath not run so smoothly, that we can venture to assume the present applicability of these principles in their full extent; nor can we allow others to reproach us with the abandonment of them, when their necessary conditions have been disturbed. A few words of S. Leo will be sufficient to clear up my meaning. Speaking of the election of a bishop, he requires "the consent of clergy and people; so that none be preferred to the more meritorious person: provided that no one be ordained against their will and without their seeking; lest the unwilling people should either condemn or hate the bishop they wished not for, and if not allowed to have him they wished for should become less loyal (*religiosa*) than is convenient."<sup>o</sup>

§. 8. Happy golden age of the Apostles, when, if controversy should perchance arise among the Faithful, the living oracles of Apostles and Elders could still be appealed to at Jerusalem; or, if aught remained unsettled, the oral or epistolary communication of Peter or Paul or John might be confidently expected to set in order what was yet wanting! Happy moreover that silver age, when, though the materials of future schisms were daily assuming shape and consistency, the halo of Apostolic charity yet rested on the Heads of the Church! Polycarp might plead the tradition of S. John and S. Philip for celebrating Easter conformably with Jewish

Fourthly, in  
General or  
Provincial  
Councils.

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.* p. 442.

<sup>o</sup> S. Leo P. P. I. Ep. 84, *ap.* Labbe, Tom. III. p. 1385.



practice; Anicetus of Rome might urge the authority of the chief of the Apostles Peter and Paul on behalf of a custom more agreeable with the liberty of the Gospel; yet the Sacrament of Unity remained unbroken. Such a state of suspense however was unfavourable to the harmony and joint action of the Episcopate. The controversy would take an angrier tone in the hands of Victor and Polycrates; the high pretensions set up for the bishops by S. Ignatius would inevitably suffer, when tradition clashed with tradition and bishop threatened bishop with excommunication. What remained for them but to meet if possible, and adjust on some principle of submission or of compromise their respective traditions? Thus in very early times Councils of bishops came to be held by reason of questions which required settlement. For as the Church and its Episcopate expanded, the chances of schism proportionably increased. As the bishop of a parish (*παροικία*) or diocese was the impersonation of the unity of his local church; so a convention of bishops was regarded as the representation of the Church in general. Thus Tertullian: "Besides throughout Greece are held in certain places those Councils of all Churches, by means whereof matters of importance are treated in common, and the representation itself of the whole Christian name is celebrated with great veneration." <sup>p</sup> And the Fathers of the Council of Arles (A.D. 314,) do not hesitate to ascribe to their own meeting "the present authority of God." <sup>q</sup>

But it was not until the time of Constantine that the Church could in a large sense realise a representation of the Christian name. This has been the special privilege of the Nicene Council, and is proved by the universal acceptance of its doctrinal decisions. Thus the Egyptian Bishops speak of it in their Letter to the Emperor Jovian: "This (faith) the Fathers that met at Nicæa confessed, and with this concur the local Churches everywhere, as in Spain and Britain and the Gauls, and of all Italy and Dalmatia, Dacia and Mœsia, Macedonia and all Greece, and in all Africa, and Sardinia, and Cyprus and Crete, Pamphylia and Lycia and Isauria, and those in Egypt and the Libyas and Pontus and Cappadocia, and those near

<sup>p</sup> Tert. De Jejuniis, c. 13, p. 552.    <sup>q</sup> Labbe, Tom. I. p. 1425.

us, and the Churches in the East, except a few of Arius his sentiments. For of all the above named we have both by experience known their mind and we have their letters."<sup>r</sup> So Pope Innocent I. saith of the authority of the Nicene Synod, that it alone "explains the mind of all bishops throughout the world;"<sup>s</sup> and S. Leo of the Nicene Canons, that they "preserve the peace of the Universal Church."<sup>t</sup> The various channels of authority which would meet in the definition of a Council are well described in the Preface to the Synod of Orange (A.D. 529): "It hath seemed just and reasonable to us, that we should put forth to be observed by all and subscribe with our hands a few articles transmitted to us by the Apostolic See, which have been gathered in this cause principally (the Pelagian) by ancient Fathers from the volumes of Holy Scriptures to teach those who think otherwise than they ought."<sup>u</sup>

A General Council may then be defined in the words of Gerson, as "a gathering made by legitimate authority to some place, out of all the Hierarchical state of the whole Catholic Church, no faithful person who may require to be heard being excluded, for the wholesome treating of and ordering those things which regard the due government of the same Church in faith and manners."<sup>v</sup> Of these General Councils, the four great and primary ones of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, have since the time of S. Gregory the Great been regarded as the four corners of the edifice of Faith; others obtain but a secondary place, and the rule with regard to them has been, "that as often as a discordant sentence is found in the acts of Councils, the sentence of that Council should be adhered to, the authority whereof is either older or superior."<sup>w</sup> Provincial Councils "have no power of defining or of constituting in general; but only of providing the observance of that which otherwise hath been appointed, generally or specially: although sometimes even the things, by them rightly appointed, the Catholic Church also may receive."<sup>x</sup>

<sup>r</sup> Labbe, Tom. II. p. 826.

<sup>s</sup> Labbe, II. p. 1268.

<sup>t</sup> Labbe, III. p. 1362.

<sup>u</sup> Labbe, T. IV. p. 1666.

<sup>v</sup> Joan. Gerson. Opp. Tom. I. p. 370.

<sup>w</sup> Gratian. I. Dist. 50. c. 28.

<sup>x</sup> Lancelotti Institut. Juris Canonici. L. i. Tit. 3.

The authority of the Universal Episcopate may now be considered as merged in the representative institution of General Councils : I speak, of course, of its *testimonial* authority in the province of doctrine. But on this head the remarks of Cardinal Panormitan are worthy of attention. Speaking of the relative authority of Popes and General Councils, he says ; “ I think however that if the Pope were moved by better reasons and authorities than the Council, one should stand by his sentence ; for a Council also may err, as otherwise it hath erred on the subject of contracting marriage between the ravisher and the ravished. And the saying of Jerome having the better sense was afterwards preferred to the statute of the Council.” For in things concerning the Faith even the saying of a single private person would be to be preferred to the saying of a Pope, if he were moved by better reasons and authorities of the Old and New Testament than the Pope. Nor doth it hinder, if it be said that a Council cannot err, because CHRIST prayed for His Church that it should not fail. For I say, that although a General Council represent the whole universal Church ; yet in truth the universal Church is not there really but representatively. For the universal Church is made up out of the sum total of all the Faithful ; whence all the Faithful of the world constitute that universal Church, the Head whereof is CHRIST Himself ; but the Pope is the Vicar of CHRIST and not truly Head of the Church. Whence it is possible, that the true Faith of CHRIST might remain in a single person ; so that it is true to say, that the Faith hath not failed in the Church, as the right of the universal body might reside in a single person while others sinned. This was evident after the Passion of CHRIST ; for faith remained only in the Blessed Virgin, for all others were scandalised ; and yet CHRIST before His passion had prayed for Peter, that his faith should not fail. Therefore it is not said to fail nor even to err, if true faith remains in a single person.”\*

To conclude with the words of the English Reformers :

\* He alludes to the Council of Meaux, A.D. 845. See Gratian. ii. Causa xxxvi. qu. 2. capp. 10, 11.

\* Panormitan. super I. parte primi Decret. *De electione*, p. 122.

"But now although we willingly pay very great honour to Councils, chiefly General, we yet judge them all to be put far below the dignity of Canonical Scriptures; moreover between Councils themselves we put a great difference. For some of them, such as be those four chief ones, of Nice, the first of Constantinople, those of Ephesus and of Chalcedon, we embrace and receive with great reverence. Which judgement indeed we pass concerning many others which were afterwards celebrated, wherein we see and confess that the most holy fathers constituted many things most gravely and holily according to the Divine Scriptures concerning the Blessed TRINITY, concerning JESUS CHRIST our LORD and SAVIOUR, and human Redemption procured through Him. To which (constitutions) however we deem our faith to be not otherwise bounden, except as far as they may be confirmed out of Holy Scriptures. For it is manifest that some Councils have sometimes erred and defined things contrary the one to the other, partly in actions of law, partly in the Faith. Let the Councils therefore be indeed read with honour and Christian reverence, but be examined meanwhile by the pious certain and right rule of the Scriptures." \* I do not however admit that it is competent for any Christian man or even National Churches to question the dogmatic ruling of Councils truly Oecumenic; which, with Leibniz, I believe God hath hitherto preserved from all error contrary to saving doctrine. (*Nouveaux Essais*, IV. c. 20.) It will appear that when Luther appealed to a Council that should judge by the Scriptures *alone*, without limiting the interpretation thereof to something more binding than the strong will of overbearing doctors, even to the consent of the Catholic Church, such appeal *left all dispute in religion endless* (see Thorndike, *Just Weights*, c. xxv §§ 9, 8).

§. 9. But the question naturally rises, when those ancient Councils met, did the Bishops take upon themselves to propound their individual sentiments on matters of doctrine, without reference to what their predecessors had written or determined, or even what distinguished writers had advanced

Fifthly, in the writings of Fathers and approved Expositors.

\* *Reformatio Legum Eccles.*, *De Fide Catholica*, cap. 14, cui titulus 'De Conciliis quid sentiendum.'

with the general acceptance of Christian people? Did they rest upon their succession from the Apostles, as if that guaranteed to them an especial and mysterious guidance into Truth and an infallibility of judgment, independent of the general promise of indefectibility made by CHRIST to His Church? The answer is ready from the Council of Ephesus, and I give it in the words of Vincent of Lerins. "This seemed to them most Catholic, faithful, and best to be done, to bring forward sentences of holy Fathers, whereof it was agreed that some were Martyrs, others Confessors, but that all were and remained throughout Catholic Bishops (*sacerdotes*); in order that the ancient dogma might be confirmed solemnly by their consent and decree, and that the blasphemy of profane novelty might be condemned." <sup>b</sup> He then enumerates ten Fathers, whose sayings were recited during the sessions of the Council as possessing testimonial authority. They were S. Peter bishop of Alexandria and martyr, S. Athanasius bishop and confessor, Theophilus bishop, S. Gregory Nazianzen bishop and confessor, S. Basil bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia and confessor, S. Gregory Nyssen bishop, SS. Felix martyr and Julius bishops of Rome, S. Cyprian bishop of Carthage and martyr, and S. Ambrose bishop of Milan. "All these," he continues, "were produced at Ephesus as Doctors, councillors, witnesses, and judges; holding whose doctrine, following whose counsel, believing whose testimony, obeying whose judgement, that blessed Synod pronounced concerning the rules of faith, without weariness, presumption, or favour. Although a far larger number of ancients might have been employed, yet it was not necessary; because the time of business could not be occupied by a multitude of witnesses, no one doubting but that those ten had really thought as did all their colleagues." <sup>c</sup>

The Greek Council *in Trullo* ordained, in almost the very words of our English Convocation of 1575, that, "if a controversy about Scripture should be stirred up, the presidents of the Churches should not otherwise interpret it than as the

<sup>b</sup> Vincent. Lirin. Commonitorium, cap. 29.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* cap. 30. See also Conc. Chalcedon. Action i. *circa finem*, ap. Labbe, T. IV. p. 309.

luminaries and Doctors of the Church had set it forth in their writings; and should gain reputation by them rather than by composing discourses of their own.”<sup>d</sup> I should be sorry to admit that the labours of the Fathers or writers of the first six centuries should supersede the efforts of all subsequent times. But I doubt whether the canon above quoted did not operate beneficially under the circumstances of the Eastern Church. Was it not better that they should be humble copyists of a purer and ancient standard, than exhibit the wretched stupidity which marked the controversy of Barlaam and Gregory Palamas touching the uncreated Light of Mount Tabor? A vigorous Theology cannot be created or maintained by hierarchical decrees any more than the *Litterae Humaniores* be made to flourish by mere patronage or endowments. There must be the living SPIRIT abroad, which GOD alone can inspire. The Cæsar Bardas was as zealous and liberal as Nicholas the Fifth or Lorenzo De Medicis; but his patronage only kept up letters, *created* nothing.

But the writings of the Fathers were always quoted in due subserviency to Holy Scripture. “Believe not absolutely even me who say this to you,” says S. Cyril of Jerusalem, “unless you receive the confirmation of it from the Divine Scriptures. For our faith is not by invention of words, but by proof of Scripture.”<sup>e</sup> S. Augustine is abundant in disclaimers of any authority at all approaching that of Canonical Scripture to be attributed to the Fathers. One passage will serve to declare his mind. “Nor ought we to hold as Canonical Scriptures the disputations of any persons whatsoever, however Catholic and lauded men; so that we may not (saving the respect due to those men) disapprove of and reject something in their writings, if perchance we find that they thought otherwise than the Truth hath it, by Divine aid understood either by others or by ourselves. So judge I the writings of others as I would have my readers judge mine.”<sup>f</sup>

It is the harmony and consent of the Fathers which we follow, not the peculiar opinion of any one of them; as Vin-

<sup>d</sup> Conc. Trullan. Canon xix. *ap.* Beveregii Synodicon, Tom. I. p. 177.

<sup>e</sup> S. Cyrill. Hierosol. Cateches. iv. c. 12. p. 56.

<sup>f</sup> S. Aug. Ep. ad Fortunatianum, cxlviii. T. II. p. 502. See also S. Aug. Ep. ad Hieronymum, lxxxi. II. p. 190.

centius saith, "However holy and learned he be, be he Bishop, Confessor, or Martyr, whatever he may have thought beside all or even against all, let that be set aside among peculiar and private opinions from the authority of the common and public sentiment; lest to the peril of our eternal salvation, according to the sacrilegious custom of heretics and schismatics, letting slip the ancient truth of the universal dogma, we should be following the novel error of a single man." <sup>s</sup>

The testimonial authority of Fathers not exclusive of later expositors.

§. 10. If then the testimonial authority of the Fathers is checked at each step by the appeal to Scripture, we clearly discern that their *consensus* doth not so limit the province of Interpretation as to dispense with the labours of later expositors. For, as Augustine saith, "A man speaketh so much more or less wisely as he hath more or less profited in Holy Scriptures. I do not say in reading them much and committing them to memory, but in well understanding them and diligently searching their meanings." <sup>h</sup> So Dominic Bannes, a Salamancan Professor, writes; "Although the holy Fathers may have erred and sometimes have in fact erred, their books however are to be read with reverence, yet with judgment and discretion; so that a prudent reader resting on the truths of the Faith and doctrine of the Catholic Church may embrace whatever he sees consonant with it, but may repel with modesty what he finds dissonant." <sup>i</sup> Jackson apologises for an occasional departure from the prescription of the Fathers in these eloquent terms; "They out of this Thy fertile and goodly field have gathered many years' provision for Thy great household Thy Church, but yet either let somewhat fall or left much behind, which may be sufficient for us Thy poor servants to glean after them, either for our own private use, or for that small flock which Thou hast set us to feed. And let all sober-hearted Christians judge, yea, let GOD that searcheth the very heart and reins, and CHRIST JESUS the Judge of all mankind, give judgment out of His Throne, whether in reasoning thus we are more

<sup>s</sup> Vincent. Lirin. Common. cap. 28. Lib. iv. c. 5. Tom. III. p. 67.

<sup>h</sup> Bannes in D. Tho. Primam

<sup>i</sup> S. Aug. De Doctrina Christiana, Part. qu. 1. art. 8. T. I. p. 57.

injurious to the Ancient Fathers deceased than they unto the Ancient of Days and Father of the World to come, in denying the free gifts and graces of His HOLY SPIRIT unto succeeding as well as former ages.”<sup>j</sup>

Durandus expresses himself in a way that would satisfy the most scrupulous advocate of Christian liberty: “But the manner of speaking and writing,” he says, “in the other matters which do not touch the Faith is, that we should rest on reason rather than on the authority of any doctor whatsoever, however celebrated or generally referred to (*solemnis*); and that all human authority be considered of little weight, when the contrary truth shines out through reason. For although our understanding is to be brought into captivity into the obedience of CHRIST, and in those things which touch the Faith we should acquiesce rather in the authority of Sacred Scripture than in any human reason whatever, because Divine knowledge which Scripture expresses exceeds human knowledge more than that does that of beasts: yet every man who foregoes reason because of human authority falls into bestial stupidity, so that he comes to be compared with silly beasts and may have become like them. For who except a rash person would dare to say that one should acquiesce in the authority of any doctor whatsoever rather than in the authority of the holy Doctors of sacred Scripture, Augustine, Gregory, Ambrose, and Jerome, whom the holy Roman Church hath exalted with a condign celebrity?” Servile deference to these Doctors is illogical, and Durandus must have known it. He then cites two passages of Augustine, and continues: “We therefore assenting to reason rather than to any human authority whatsoever prefer not authority to reason; observing that it is a sacred point to honour before all existing friends Truth, which all earth invokes, even heaven itself blesses: blessed be the GOD of Truth. Amen.”<sup>k</sup>

§. 11. A few words may not unfitly be added here touching the Development and Reformation of Doctrine. No really new dogma can be introduced as co-ordinate with the original deposit of the Faith. But as any one side of Truth comes incidentally to be more insisted on to the possible

Of Development  
of Doctrine.

<sup>j</sup> Works, Vol. I. p. 307.

<sup>k</sup> Durand, in. Præfat. p. 3.



disarrangement of the harmony of doctrine, or presumed consequences are unduly pressed on our acceptance, the very repression of particular assertions or even the stricter enunciation of a previously accepted dogma breaks in upon us frequently in the light of novelty. Thus, although Catholics have from the beginning confessed the doctrine of the Sacred TRINITY, the terms which they have chosen to express it by have been suggested by a long experience of heresies. "The Fathers," as the Synod of Chalcedon hath it, "introduced the dogma of the Three Hypostases (or Persons), framing their invention not outside of Scripture, neither passing by the intelligence of the Faith as useless, but making it clear by the inspired sayings, contending for the matter of the *Homo-ousios*, and showing that the Faith set forth to us one Essence in two Persons, and did not proscribe the very being of the Son."<sup>1</sup> But the same Synod protests against the thought of a real addition to the dogmas of Faith: "Since many turn aside from the straight road to the paths of error, devising some new way for their falsehood, we too must confute them by the inventions of Truth, and set the disproof in opposition to their devices, not coining afresh from time to time something that was wanting in the Faith, but devising what is expedient for their innovations."<sup>m</sup> But if a clearer definition of dogma go beyond previous definitions, how doth it differ from a new Article of Faith? (Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*, IV. c. 20). Some would fain construe history into treason against the Catholic Church; but the *present* Church must not prove false to Tradition, nor refuse evidence of truth in the records of by-past ages. (Thornd. Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 595.)

S. Vincent of Lerins expresses the kind of development, of which the Catholic dogmas are capable. "O Timothy, priest, tractator, doctor, if the Divine gift hath made thee fit in ability, exercise, doctrine, be the Bezaleel of the spiritual tabernacle, cut out the precious gems of the Divine doctrine, fit them faithfully, adorn them wisely, add splendour, grace, beauty. What was more obscurely believed before, let it be understood more clearly by thy exposition. Let posterity rejoice that that hath been understood through thee, which

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Chalced. Pt. iii. cap. 1. *ap.* Labbe, T. IV. p. 822.

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid.*

before not being understood antiquity venerated. Teach however the same things which thou hast learnt; so that, when thou sayest in a new way thou mayest not say new things." <sup>a</sup>

§. 12. If an adherence to the line of prescription be a test of legitimate Catholic development, if will follow accordingly that legitimate Reformation in Religion is that which adheres to the maxim *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, as far as it really will bear application; by which I mean, only to certain great points of doctrine and discipline. It is that which seeks to correct the exaggeration of some principles, the practical abeyance of others, whether occasioned by lapse of time or lack of fidelity or other reasons. It is no sound or real Reformation, which seeks to overturn the old foundations, but rather a Revolution in Religion. The Faith may be revived when languishing, it may receive additions in the way of more explicit statements of what its principles virtually contain from the beginning; but it cannot lose or gain substantially without a transmutation fatal to its Divine origin. On this head we must still hold with the Synod of Carthage (under the presidency of Boniface, A.D. 525); "We cannot change the ordinances, which are known to have been preserved by Divine instinct by so many bishops (*sacerdotes*). For if we admit that what has been before constituted may be called in question, nothing shall obtain any security in divine and human actions, nothing in sacred and public matters; whilst after long years our posterity may seem as though more instructed to make changes as it were to correct their fathers." <sup>o</sup> Compare with this Thorndike's *marvellous* assertion, that parts of the whole Church may reform "without the consent, yet not against the authority of the whole;" which truly is ambiguous. (Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 475.) He means, though "without the consent of the" presently existing Church, "yet not against the authority of" the whole; taking the Past, as well as the reforming Part, as constituents of that Whole.

If Catholics are charged with dereliction of principle, when circumstances oblige them to withdraw from the com-

<sup>a</sup> Vinc. Lirin. Common. cap. 22.

<sup>o</sup> Labbe, Tom. IV. p. 1645.

munion of Bishops who violate the *consensus* of the Church, the answer is supplied by the Council of Constantinople (*Prima et Secunda*) in the time of Photius; "They who separate themselves from communion with their bishop on account of any heresy condemned by the Holy Synods or Fathers, while he evidently proclaims the heresy publicly and teaches it with bare front in church, such persons, in excluding themselves from communion with their so-called bishop before Synodical cognizance, not only shall not be subject to canonical censure, but shall even be deemed worthy by the orthodox of becoming honour. For they condemn as teachers, not Bishops, but pseudo-bishops; and they do not cut up the unity of the Church by schism, but hasten to deliver her from schisms and divisions." <sup>p</sup>

And if any ancient Rite originally innocent or even laudable can be really proved to have issued in scandalous and pernicious practices, Gratian the father of the Canon Law cites with approbation the example of King Hezekiah's destroying the Brazen Serpent. "And hereby that authority is to be held great in the Church, that, if some of our predecessors have done things, which at the time might have been without blame but afterwards are turned into error and superstition, they may be destroyed by posterity without hesitation and with great authority." <sup>q</sup>

In reply to such as would acquiesce in a dogmatic profession 'against all satisfaction of *conscience*,' and 'give themselves up to follow that whereby they may live and thrive by' under the protection of the secular power, judge 'whether there be more of *atheism* or of Christianity' therein. (Thornd. vol. ii. Pt. II. p. 597. See my *Institutes of Canon Law*, Pt. II. ch. xxv. p. 176.)

Let it however be carefully noted, before a portion of the Church embarks on the perilous adventure of 'Reformation,' that the canons and customs of the Church, yea, and generally its doctrinal traditions, are remains and evidence of the conversation delivered over by the successors of our LORD to His Church. It were better to bear even unreasonable bur-

<sup>p</sup> Beveregii Synodicon, Tom. I. p. 354.

<sup>q</sup> Gratian. Decret. Dist. lxxiii. c. 28.

thens than to risk the loss of a single truth or one Apostolic ordinance. What will you grant to the Catholic Church? If we believe it, we must grant it the power of a vice-gerent, to limit where He hath not limited expressly, and to testify His pleasure where Scripture records it not. (Thornd. vol. iv. pp. 345, 355.)

But I must guard my meaning by observing that the people of God, as well as "the human race and its individuals, are capable of training, and that there are epochs marked out for the progress of thought in the eternal march of Time." This remark of a gifted lady (Mme. De Staël, *L'Allemagne*, Pt. IV. c. ii.) has been developed by Bishop Temple (*Essays and Reviews*) and lives in Tennyson's line, "And the thoughts of men are widen'd by the process of the suns." (*Locksley Hall*.) So, when the Synod of Chalcedon apparently assumes in its definition to lock up the powers of Synods in all time by its own action, we must mind that it refers to the 'tradition of the Fathers' as its warrant.

## CHAPTER IV.

## OF THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Of the Exist-  
ence of God.

§. 1. IN approaching the subject of the Being of God, a Christian Philosopher may with Plato entertain the hope, that "having betaken himself to the vast Ocean of the Beautiful and contemplating many fair and magnificent arguments, he may also give birth to thoughts in abundant philosophy;"<sup>r</sup> but it will behove him to remember with S. Hilary, that "there is need of the new feelings of a regenerate mind, that a man's own conscience may illuminate him according to the gift of heavenly origin. Conscious of having been made a partaker of the Divine Nature, let him measure it not by the laws of his own nature, but according to the magnificence of GOD's witness concerning Himself. When therefore we discourse of the things of GOD, let us concede the knowledge of Himself to GOD, and wait on His sayings with pious veneration. For He is a fitting witness to Himself Who is not known save through Himself. But if anywhere treating of the Nature and Birth of GOD we should bring forward instances of comparison, let no one think they contain absolutely in themselves the perfect reason. For comparison of earthly things to GOD there is none; but our infirm intelligence hath collected certain kinds of inferior things, seeking indications of the higher; that we may be led out of the consciousness of our sense to the opinion of a sense unwonted. Therefore every comparison should be esteemed useful to man rather than suitable to GOD."<sup>s</sup>

The general argument on behalf of the existence of GOD

<sup>r</sup> Plato, Symposium, §. 34, Vol. V. p. 87, Ed. Bekker.

<sup>s</sup> S. Hilar. De Trinitate, Lib. i. circa initium.

"the Maker and Preserver of all things," rendered so familiar to us in the pages of Paley's *Natural Theology*, is well stated by S. Gregory Nazianzen in the following terms: "Of this, (namely) that GOD is and that there is a Cause productive and conservative of all things, our sight instructs us, and the Law of Nature: the one meets its objects well established, in progress, and in motion, carried on, so to say, immoveably; the other by means of the things seen infers the Author of them. For how came this universe to subsist or to hold together, unless GOD gave being to and doth hold together all things? For he that sees a lyre beautifully fashioned with its harmony and good arrangement, and hears its music, thinks of nothing else but of the maker and the player of the lyre, and will recur to him in thought, even though he should not know him by sight: so also to us That Which makes and moves and preserves the things that are made is evident, even though It be not comprehended by thought; and he is exceedingly void of judgment who doth not willingly advance thus far and follow the demonstrations of Nature."<sup>4</sup>

The argument derived from Motion, which was a favourite theme of the Greek Philosophers,<sup>5</sup> is employed by Maimonides and Aquinas;<sup>6</sup> but as it is only a form of the argument from causality and is more connected with philosophy than theology, I forbear to dwell upon it.<sup>7</sup>

That the existence of GOD cannot be demonstrated by natural reason but requires direct Divine Revelation is a position, attributed to Maimonides, and has been maintained by Cardinal Peter d'Ailly alone among the Schoolmen; but the contrary sentiment is universally followed by Theologians. The Being or existence of God<sup>8</sup> may be demonstrated from His works in creation; but His Substance<sup>9</sup> can only be inferred in general and with an incomplete and inadequate knowledge. But this knowledge however imperfect is insisted upon by S. Paul as quite sufficient practically to condemn the

<sup>4</sup> S. Greg. Naziansen. Orat. xxxiv. Opp. T. I. p. 539.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Arist. Phys. L. viii.

<sup>6</sup> More Nevochim, Part ii. c. 1; Summa, I. qu. 2, art. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Vid. Petavii Dogmata Theol. L. i. c. 2.

<sup>8</sup> "Scientia quidditatis Dei seu τοῦ ὄντος." Maimonides, M. N. I. c. 46.

<sup>9</sup> "Scientia τοῦ τίς ἐστίν." *Ibid.*

Gentiles, because it partakes of the nature of the highest probability; which is universally regarded as enough for human action. "Because that which may be known of GOD is manifest to them; for GOD hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew GOD, they glorified Him not as GOD, neither were thankful."\*

This demonstration of the existence of GOD from creation may be exhibited in three ways. First, through *causality*, or, as Aquinas terms it, '*ex ratione causæ efficientis*;' for there is no circulation or interchange among efficient causes ordained *per se* (as distinguished from accidental causes), because efficient causes ordained *per se* are related to one another as cause and effect; for that which is later is always the effect of the prior and depends on it as on its cause, inasmuch as in this consists such an order, that one thing is from another effectively, and that from another, and so always. If efficient causes ordained *per se* were infinite, it would be necessary towards the production of any effect you please that infinite causes should concur in the act, which is impossible; that is, the human understanding acquiesces in its inability to entertain such a notion. Therefore we are forced to conceive a First Cause of infinite perfection, which we call GOD. Secondly, by the way of excellency, or, as Durandus hath it, '*per viam eminentiæ*,' whereby from the specific perfections of creatures we infer that there is complete and sovereign perfection in the Creator. Thirdly, by the way of negation or, according to Durandus, of remotion, whereby we reject concerning GOD whatever is imperfect in the creatures. Every thing which is from another as its cause may lose its being by the withdrawal of that influence; but, having arrived at the idea of GOD as the First Cause and attributed to Him infinite perfection, it is a logical consequence we should remove from our conception of Him all possibility of defect.\*

Vasquez adds two further reasons. The one drawn from

\* Rom. i. 19—21.

\* Bannes, in D. Tho. Part I. qu.

2, art. 2, p. 79. Durand. I. dist. 3.

qu. 2.

moral philosophy is of this kind, namely, that the denial of the being of GOD would be attended by the fatal consequences of denying the immortality of the soul and the rewarding of virtue and punishment of vice after this life. And as virtue is not always rewarded in this life nor vice punished, the incentives to virtue and the dissuasives from vice would be done away with, and the principles of social order be destroyed. The other reason borrowed from S. Anselm may be thus stated. GOD is that than which nothing better can be conceived; but that, than which nothing better can be conceived, cannot be in thought alone, for so it would not be better; for that is better which is in thought and reality; therefore in the nature of things GOD is.<sup>b</sup>

Still this proof of the existence of GOD falls far short of any demonstrative science of His nature and substance. As S. Clement of Alexandria saith, "Demonstrative science consists of prior and more known principles; but nothing exists before the Unbegotten. It remains therefore that we understand the Unknown (*τὸ ἄγνωστον*) by grace and the Reason Alone that proceeds from Him: as also Luke makes mention of Paul saying, 'Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, To the Unknown GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.'<sup>c</sup> Every thing then which falls under a name is begotten, whether people will or not. Whether therefore the FATHER Himself draweth to Himself every one that hath lived purely and hath advanced to the conception of the Incorruptible Nature; or whether the principle of free will in us (*τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτεξούσιον*), having arrived at the knowledge of Good, exults and leaps over the fences, as the trainers say; anyhow not without especial grace doth the soul plume herself and rise above the superincumbent obstacles, putting aside every thing that depresses her. And Plato too says in the Meno that Virtue is divinely bestowed, as these words show; 'From this reasoning then, O Meno, Virtue appears to us to come by a divine destiny to those to

<sup>b</sup> Vasquez in D. Tho. Part I. qu. 2, art. 3, cap. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xvii. 22, 23.



whom she comes.' Doth he not seem to thee by 'divine destiny' to have conjectured the habit of knowledge that cometh to all? But he adds more clearly; 'But if now we in all this discourse have well inquired, Virtue would be neither by nature nor by education, but a thing that comes by a divine allotment, not without understanding, to whom it comes. Wisdom then divinely bestowed, being the FATHER's virtue, urges our free will, and accepts our faith, and requites our attention by the summary communication of election.'" <sup>d</sup>

Estius warns us against confounding this primary knowledge of GOD, of which I have been treating, with saving revealed knowledge. "There is no need of peculiar illumination or revelation, such as is that of faith, towards all knowledge; for this reason, because the powers of human nature not yet repaired through CHRIST are still adequate to perceiving from the creatures some kind of knowledge even of GOD Himself: as without the grace of GOD through CHRIST man can do much in human duties, not carrying him on to the salvation of eternal life, but only conducing to honest conversation in this temporal life; which things however, in so far as they are good, are all to be referred to GOD as their author."\*

Of the At-  
tributes of  
God in  
general.

§. 2. From the consideration of the Being of GOD let us proceed to examine the results of that knowledge; which consist in our predicating of GOD certain affirmations of all that is good and perfect in ourselves to the utmost extent our thought can reach, and certain negations of all that is evil or imperfect; in a word, His Attributes. S. Clement of Alexandria writes; "The Apostle John saith, 'No man hath seen GOD at any time; the only-begotten SON, which is in the bosom of the FATHER, He hath declared Him.'"<sup>e</sup> But as he hath named the Unseen and the Ineffable 'the bosom' of GOD, some have hence called Him Profound, as embracing the universe, Unattainable and Infinite. Yea certainly, the most difficult argument to be handled concerning GOD is this. For since the cause of any thing is difficult of discovery, in every way is the First and Eldest Cause difficult of demonstra-

<sup>d</sup> S. Clem. Alex. Strom. L. v. p. 429.

\* Estius, in Sent. L. i. Dist. 3, §. 6.

<sup>e</sup> S. John i. 18.

tion, which also to all other things is the cause of their creation and preservation. For how can that be expressed, which is neither genus nor difference nor species nor indivisible nor number, nor yet an accident nor subject? Nor would one correctly call Him a Whole (*ὅλον*): for the whole is said in respect of magnitude, and He is the FATHER of the universe. Nor certainly should we speak of parts in Him; for the One is indivisible, wherefore also It is infinite; conceived of according as it hath neither dimension nor boundary. And therefore It hath neither figure nor name. And should we at any time name It improperly, calling It either One or Good or Intellect or the Self-existing or FATHER or GOD or Creator or LORD, we speak not as expressing His Name; but out of perplexity we use fair names, that the mind may not wander, but support itself on these. For any particular name is not indicative of GOD, but all collectively declare His power; for predicables are spoken either from persons' properties or from their mutual relations; but none of these is it possible to admit concerning GOD."<sup>c</sup>

Nazianzen observes, "No man hath ever found out nor yet shall find out GOD, what He is in nature and essence. But as to whether he shall ever find out, let him seek this from whom he may and philosophize about it. But he shall find it, as my reason goes, when this Godlike and Divine thing (I mean our intellect and reason) shall have conversed with what is proper to it, and the image have ascended to its archetype, which it at present desires. And this seems to me to be that which is supremely an object of philosophy, that we shall some time or other know even as we are known. But at present all that transpires to us is a brief emanation and a slight reflexion as it were of a great light; so that even if a person knew GOD or hath been credited with knowing Him, he knew so much as to have appeared more enlightened."<sup>d</sup>

"The Divine Nature Itself, as far as it is given us to know It in this world wherein we see not but through a glass darkly, is made known by Its attributes. These are not common accidents, nor properties, really distinct from the

<sup>c</sup> S. Clem. Alex. Strom. L. v. p. 428.

<sup>d</sup> S. Greg. Nazianzen. Orat. xxxiv. Tom. I. p. 548.

Divine Essence; but are one and the same thing with the Divine Essence, and designate its manifold perfection, according to our mode of considering it. \* \* The distinction then which is made between the Essence of GOD and His Attributes as also between the Attributes themselves, doth not proceed on the side of GOD, but on that of our conceptions; which however are not formed according to our fancy, but have their foundation in reality. The Divine Essence unfolds Itself in Its operations in different ways, according to the diversity of Its objects. But the weakness of our understanding doth not permit us to represent Its perfection by one simple and adequate conception; and so our mind forms many inadequate conceptions, by each of them representing to itself the Divine Essence, as it were by parts; which conceptions however are founded on the diverse operations of GOD.”<sup>1</sup> The mind, dazzled as it were by the majesty of the primary notion of GOD, endeavours to recollect itself by recounting and reflecting upon the separate items of its acquirement; hence the Greek Fathers term such iterated thought ‘second notions,’ ‘considerations,’ and ‘reflexions,’ *ἐπινόαιαι*, *ἐπενθυμήσεις* and *ἐπιλογισμοί*.<sup>2</sup>

Two extremes of vicious opposition to what has been stated exist; the one holds that there is no distinction whatever between the Attributes and Essence of GOD, not even in our conception; the other makes the Attributes to be essential and natural distinctions; in a word, personifies them. Aëtius and Eunomius may be considered as representing the first class of thinkers; who, in order the more easily to maintain their position that the SON of GOD was a created Being and therefore essentially unlike the FATHER (*ἀνόμοιος τῷ Πατρὶ*), held that the bare notion of Deity necessarily involves the notions of abstract goodness, power, and wisdom, what is commonly called His Essence and attributes being in their view identical; so that the teaching of Scripture concerning the SON as the Personal Wisdom of the Deity was lost or denied.

The opposite error is one that proceeds from an attempt

<sup>1</sup> Limborch, Theol. Christ. L. ii. cap. 2. §§. 1—3.

<sup>2</sup> See Petavius, Dogmata Theol. L. i. c. ix. §. 2.

to realise in too gross and material a manner that which the mind conceives of GOD through His operations. We find a most notable instance of this in what the Jewish Cabbalists teach about the ten *Sephiroth* or *Splendours* proceeding from GOD. They are regarded as distinct pulsations in the vast ocean of the Divine Being ; separately discernible as the blue or red or purple coruscations in a brilliant flame ; as independent emanations issuing from the One GOD, whereby He communicates with all created beings.\* All perfections which are predicated of the Divine Essence are supposed to be (so to say) substantiated in the Sephiroth, and to be through them manifested to the creatures. And this idea seems to me to have aided Valentinus in the imagination of the thirty *Æones*, as well as the Platonic doctrine of archetypal ideas. Certainly it appears to have assisted in suggesting the Arian notion of the successive or graduated subordination of the Persons in the Blessed TRINITY, as may be seen from the charge brought against the Priscillianists of Spain by S. Leo, A.D. 447. He addresses Turibius bishop of Astorga in these words : “ In the second article is shown the silly and vain device touching the processions of certain virtues out of GOD, which He began to have, and which He Himself hath preceded in His Essence : wherein they support the error of the Arians also, saying, that the FATHER is prior to the SON, because He was some time without the SON, and then began to be FATHER when He begat the SON. But, as the Catholic Church detests those, so also she doth these, who think that that was ever wanting to GOD which belongs to His Essence. Whom as it is impiety to call mutable, so also is it (impiety) to attribute proficiency to Him. For as that which is diminished is changed, so also is that changed which admits of augmentation.”<sup>1</sup> There is, however, an orthodox doctrine of the subordination of Persons, as stated below in Chap. V., §. 11.

In the same extreme of Realistic error, though in a

\* They are called The Crown ; Wisdom ; Understanding ; Might or Severity ; Mercy or Magnificence ; Beauty ; Victory or Eternity ; Glory ; The Foundation ; and The King-

dom. See Basnage, History of the Jews, Lib. iii. cap. 14.

<sup>1</sup> S. Leo P.P. I. Ep. 93, ap. Labbe, Tom. III. p. 1411.

different form, is the opinion assigned by S. Bernard to Gilbert De la Poirée, bishop of Poitiers ; who separated the properties and attributes of GOD not only from each other but from His Essence, not only in our conception of them but also in reality. By refusing to acknowledge the actual identity of the subject indicated by the terms 'GOD' and 'Divinity,' and affirming that the former concrete term derived itself from the latter as from its form, he appears to have been open to a charge of Tritheism, and of Pantheistic impiety.<sup>m</sup>

I will sum up in the words of Damascene ; "The Divinity is simple and incomposite ; but that which is made up of many and different parts is composite. If then we should affirm the being Uncreate, Without beginning, Incorporeal, Immortal, Eternal, Good, Possessed of Creative Power, and such like, to be essential differences in the case of GOD ; that which is made up of so many things will not be simple but composite, which it would be impious to say. We must needs then suppose that each of the Divine Attributes marks, not what He is in essence, but either what He is not, or His relation to something contrasted with Him or attendant on His nature, or His operation."<sup>n</sup>

§. 3. Before we examine the special Attributes of GOD, I think it necessary to explain how terms implying material existence are predicated of GOD in Holy Scripture. Maimonides observes, that, inasmuch as the mass of mankind cannot see how anything can truly and beyond doubt exist unless it be corporeal, and as it was necessary to lead them to believe that GOD is and hath all perfections, that is, that He doth not simply exist as heaven and earth exist, but that He is a living, wise, Almighty, active Being, in order to impress on their minds His existence, it was demonstrated to them by the similitude of corporeal existence, and His Life by that of motion. To give examples whereof, first, instruments or organs of local motion are attributed to Him, as "My footstool,"<sup>o</sup> and "the place of My feet ;"<sup>p</sup> next, instruments of touch, as, "the finger of GOD,"<sup>q</sup> "the hand of GOD,"<sup>r</sup> "the arm of the LORD,"<sup>s</sup> "the

Of the  
Corporeal  
Attributes  
of God.

<sup>m</sup> See Petavius, L. i. cap. 10.

<sup>n</sup> S Jo. Damascen. De Orthod. Fide, L. i. c. 9.

<sup>o</sup> Isa. lxvi. 1.

<sup>p</sup> *Ibid.* lx. 13.

<sup>q</sup> Exod. viii. 19 ; Ps. viii. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Ps. cxxxix. 5.

<sup>s</sup> Isa. liii. 1.

right hand of the LORD.”<sup>t</sup> So are instruments of speech, as, the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it;”<sup>u</sup> “Oh that GOD would speak, and open His lips against thee;”<sup>v</sup> “the voice of the LORD is powerful;”<sup>w</sup> “and His tongue as a devouring fire.”<sup>x</sup> So organs of the senses are attributed to Him; as, “His eyes behold, His eyelids try, the children of men;”<sup>y</sup> “Incline Thine ear, O LORD, and hear.”<sup>z</sup>

It is also remarked that of the internal organs only the heart is attributed to GOD, the bowels being according to Maimonides synonymous with ‘heart’ in the passages where the term *meajim* occurs.<sup>a</sup> So also shoulders and the nutritive organs are not attributed, because they imply infirmity; nor are taste and touch, because they are more gross and material even in the common apprehension than the other senses. We read in Scripture, “And GOD saw,”<sup>b</sup> “And GOD heard,”<sup>c</sup> “And the LORD smelled:”<sup>d</sup> but nowhere ‘GOD tasted’ or ‘GOD touched.’ The reason is that it is fixed in the minds of men that GOD is not joined with bodies through bodily touch, because they cannot see Him Himself: for taste and touch apprehend their objects by contact, but the other senses can apprehend theirs though they be far removed from them. On the same ground of the more immediate sense of the imperfection of one portion of our nature, Fancy and Imagination, being felt to be imperfect apprehensions, are not attributed to GOD; while Thought and Understanding are, because their imperfection is not so apparent.<sup>e</sup>

Many things said concerning GOD symbolically have a higher meaning; for the Deity is simple and incomposite. By the eyes of GOD and His eyelids and sight, we understand His overseeing power and unerring knowledge, because with us this sense engenders more perfect satisfaction; by His ears and hearing, His disposition to be propitiated, for through this sense we also become favourable to those who intreat us.

<sup>t</sup> Ps. cxviii. 15.

<sup>u</sup> Isa. i. 20.

<sup>v</sup> Job xi. 5.

<sup>w</sup> Ps. xxix. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Isa. xxx. 27.

<sup>y</sup> Jer. xxxii. 19; Ps. xi. 4.

<sup>z</sup> Isa. xxxvii. 17.

<sup>a</sup> Isa. lxiii. 15; Jer. xxxi. 20.

<sup>b</sup> Gen. i. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. xxi. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Ib. viii. 21.

<sup>e</sup> Maimonides, More Nevochim, Pars I. capp. 46, 47.

By His mouth and speech, we understand the declaring of His will, because with us the thoughts of our hearts are signified through speech. By meat and drink, our concurrence with His will; for we too through the sense of taste fulfil the necessities of nature. By His smelling, His disposition to accept our goodwill towards Him, for that the perception of fragrance is with us begotten through this sense. By His face, the manifestation of Him through His operations, from our expression coming through the face. By His hands, the despatch of His work, for we perform the most important concerns with our own hands. By His touch, His more accurate distinguishing and exacting even of the most subtle and hidden things; from the circumstance that with us the feeling betrays what we conceal. By His feet and going, His presence to succour them that need, from our coming and going by the use of the feet. By His oath, the unchangeableness of His will, because our mutual covenants are established by oath. By His wrath, His hatred towards sin; for we too hating what is opposed to our judgment are wroth. By His forgetting and sleep, the delay of His vengeance against His enemies, and the putting off of His wonted aid to His people; in fine, all that is corporeally said of GOD from what is natural to us teaches things that are above us.”<sup>f</sup>

Of the  
Incommuni-  
cable Attri-  
butes of  
God: first,  
of His Sim-  
plicity or  
Spirituality.

§. 4. Let us now proceed to consider in detail some of the special Attributes of GOD, but chiefly those which are of most importance in dogmatic Theology: and first, we will treat of the Simplicity, Spirituality, and Incomprehensibility of GOD.

To affirm that GOD is a personal Being, invisible and incorporeal, coextensive with yet infinitely exceeding the material universe, is the especial province of Revelation: to affirm the contrary, yet to rise from local superstitions to the acknowledgment of an all-pervading Intelligence co-extensive with the visible framework of things but not above or beyond it, was the boast of heathen wisdom. Thus Pliny writes: “That the world and this which it hath pleased us to call by another name ‘Heaven’ is Divinity eternal, immense, unbe-

<sup>f</sup> S. Jo. Damascen. De Orthod. Fide, Lib. i. c. 11.

gotten and imperishable, it is reasonable to believe. To search into its bowels is neither men's business nor does the human mind take it in. It is sacred, eternal, immense, whole in wholeness, yea truly itself wholeness, finite yet infinite, of all things certain yet uncertain; without, within, embracing all things in itself; and the same the work of Nature and Nature itself." Then after a few words about the elements and planets, he proceeds; "Wherefore to search for the form of God I consider a part of human weakness. Whoever GOD is (if only He is other than Nature) He is entire sense, He is entire sight, entire hearing, entire in soul, entire in mind, entire in Himself."<sup>s</sup>

S. Epiphanius attributes the same opinion to the Stoics, namely, that they held that 'God was the Mind belonging to the entire visible shell (*κύτρου*) of the universe, as the soul in a body."<sup>a</sup> The consequence of this would be, that some would soon appropriate the attribution of Divinity to what they considered the most noble form of material nature. Revelation plainly contradicts all such theories. "I asked the earth," says S. Augustine, "and it said, I am not it; and whatsoever things are in the earth confessed the same thing. I asked the sea and the deeps and the creeping things of animate nature, and they answered, We are not thy God, seek above us. I asked the blowing breezes, and universal air with its inhabitants saith, Anaximenes is deceived, I am not GOD. I asked heaven, the sun, the moon, the stars; Neither are we GOD whom thou seekest, say they. And I said to all those things which stand round about me: Ye have told me of my GOD that ye are not He, tell me something about Him. And they exclaimed with a loud voice; He Himself made us."<sup>1</sup>

That this gross notion of a corporeal GOD must have been entertained among the Jews may perhaps be inferred from the Sadducees denying the existence of Angels and Spirits. Of course they lost many direct testimonies by their rejection of all Scriptures besides the Pentateuch; but even there they

<sup>s</sup> Plinius, *Naturalis Historiæ*  
Lib. ii. capp. 1, 7.

<sup>a</sup> Hæres. v. T. I. p. 12.

<sup>1</sup> S. Aug. Confession. Lib. x. c.  
6. Tom. I. p. 174.



might have learnt a purer theology; for in the book of Numbers GOD is twice called 'the GOD of the Spirits of all flesh.'<sup>1</sup> Among Christians it would appear that some in Origen's time inferred the corporeal nature of the Deity from such a passage as, "For the LORD thy GOD is a consuming fire;"<sup>2</sup> for he meets their error by citing the Gospel of S. John as a key to the true exposition.<sup>1</sup> That Tertullian erred or at least slipped into indefensible language on this subject is evident from at least one passage in his works;<sup>3</sup> but S. Augustine endeavours to screen him by supposing that he meant by 'body,' not that which admits of extension, but substance or reality as opposed to shadow or unreality.<sup>4</sup> But an undoubted instance of a class of Anthropomorphites (as they were termed) may be shown in the followers of Audius in Mesopotamia soon after the Council of Nice; who was led into error by too material an interpretation of the passage, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."<sup>5</sup> The notion probably had lingered among the Eastern Christians as a relic of Ebionism and a trace of the influence of Judaizing opinions.<sup>6</sup>

On the contrary we have it expressly said in Scripture; "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the LORD spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire: lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female."<sup>7</sup> And S. Paul saith; "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of GOD, we ought not to think that the GODHEAD is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device."<sup>8</sup> And else-

<sup>1</sup> Numb. xvi. 22; xxvii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. iv. 24.

<sup>3</sup> S. Jo. iv. 24. Peri Archon, Lib. i. c. 1.

<sup>4</sup> "Nam et dexteram et oculos et pedes Dei legimus; nec ideo tamen humanis comparabuntur, quia de appellatione sociantur. Quanta erit diversitas Divini corporis et humani sub eisdem nominibus membrorum, tanta erit et animi Divini et humani differentia, sub eisdem licet vocabulis sensuum, quos tam corruptorios efficit in ho-

mine corruptibilitas substantiæ humanæ quam incorruptorios efficit in Deo incorruptibilitas substantiæ Divinæ." Tert. adv. Marcion. Lib. i. cap. 16.

<sup>5</sup> S. Aug. De Hæresibus, cap. 86.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. i. 26. S. Epiph. Hæres. 70.

<sup>7</sup> See a quotation from the xviiith of the Clementine Homilies by Alethinus, *ap.* Petavii Dogmata Theol. Lib. ii. cap. 1. §. 9, p. 88.

<sup>8</sup> Deut. iv. 15, 16.

<sup>9</sup> Acts xvii. 29.

where he represents the sin of the heathen in depicting God in any bodily form to be, "that, when they knew God, they glorified Him *not as God*," but "changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man;" "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen."\*

We affirm then that God is a spirit; which is "a most pure essence immaterial, free of all bodily bulk and concretion, whose proper and essential act is to think."† "That He is incorporeal is evident; for how should the Immense and Infinite and Without figure and Intangible and Invisible and Simple and Incomposite be a Body? How should He be adorable, if circumscribed and subject to passion? How impassible, if composed of elements and again resolved into them? For composition is a principle of contention, contention of separation, separation of solution, and solution is utterly foreign to God. And how shall it be that God pervades all things? as the Scripture saith, 'Do not I fill Heaven and earth?' saith the LORD."‡ For it is impossible that a body should pervade bodies without being intermixed as liquids are mingled together. But if some say that He is an immaterial body, like that which the Greek philosophers call the '*fifth body*,' πέμπτον σώμα, (which is impossible,) at all events it would be in motion like the heaven, for they call this 'the fifth body.' Who then is he that moveth it? for everything that moves is set in motion by another. And we go on endlessly until we arrive at some one that is immoveable. For the first that gives motion is immoveable, and that is God. And how shall that which is in motion not be circumscribed by place? We must therefore suppose the Deity incorporeal." But neither does this set forth His Essence, any more than do other things that are said concerning God. For they signify not what He is but what He

\* Rom. i. 21, 23, 25.

† Limborch, Lib. ii. cap. 4, §. 1.

‡ Jerem. xxiii. 24.

† Another reason is assigned by Origen for not supposing God who is the Principle of all things to be

composite; "lest perchance the elements, whereof everything that is called composite hath been composed, be found prior to the Principle itself." Peri Archon, Lib. i. c. 1.

is not; but he that would tell the essence of a thing should say what it is, not what it is not. Nevertheless in the case of GOD, to say what He is according to Essence is impossible; but it is more proper to frame our discourse by abstraction, for He is above all things that are and above being itself." \*

In conclusion we say with Origen; "So then the works of Divine Providence and of the universe are as it were certain rays of GOD's nature, in comparison with His substance and nature. Since our mind cannot behold GOD Himself by Himself as He is, it conceives the Parent of the universe from the beauty of His works and the grace of the creatures. GOD therefore is not to be supposed to be either a body, or in a body, but a simple intellectual nature, admitting no addition to itself of more or less, but It is on every side a Monad, and (so to say) Whole, and the Mind and Source of all intellectual nature." \*

Against  
Pantheism.

§. 5. One question usually propounded by the schoolmen remains to be noticed, which is connected with the foregoing observations; namely, whether GOD enters into the composition of any creature. It may be that He is incomposite Himself, but does He not enter into the universal nature of things and form an integral portion of them? Is it not written that "in Him we live and move and have our being?" True it is that He pervades all things by His presence and controls all things by His power; but it is as a Person separate and distinct from, not mixed up with, the created universe. The contrary assertion is commonly called Pantheism or Spinosism. According to Eusebius \* it was the opinion of Thales and Democritus; and it was held by Varro and other Romans. \*

Among Christians, the first who appear to have held Pantheistic views are the Priscillianists of Spain; in opposition to

\* S. Joan. Damascen. De Orthod. Fide, L. i. cap. 4. In the same spirit Maimonides says that negative attributes of GOD should be multiplied, while the use of affirmative ones is pronounced to be dangerous. More Nevochim, Part I. cap. 60.

\* Peri Archon, Lib. i. cap. 1.

\* Acts xvii. 28.

\* Preparat. Evang. L. xiv. c. 6.

\* S. Aug. De Civ. Dei, L. vii. c. 6. It is expressed by Virgil in the well-known lines, "Principio ocelum ac terras, camposque liquentes, Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque astra, Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus Mens agit at molem et magno se corpore miscet." Æneid. L. vi.

whom the First Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) confesses, that "the soul of man is not a Divine substance or equal to God, but we say it is a creature created by the Divine Will."<sup>b</sup> And S. Leo says of them, that "they assert the soul of man to be of Divine substance, and that the nature of our condition differs not from the nature of its Creator. Which impiety proceeding from the opinion of certain philosophers and Manichæans the Catholic Faith condemns, knowing that nothing created is so sublime and sovereign that GOD Himself should be its nature."<sup>c</sup> Instances of Mediæval Pantheism are noticed in Peter Abelard, who, according to S. Bernard, taught that the HOLY SPIRIT was the soul of the universe;<sup>d</sup> in Almaric, in the time of Pope Innocent III., who said that all things were one and of the same nature, yea, that all things were GOD, and GOD Himself was the essence of all things;<sup>e</sup> and in David De Dinando, who made GOD to be the first matter.<sup>f</sup> Spinoza also held that creatures are but modifications of the one only substance of GOD, like impressions in wax. (Leibniz, *Opp.* p. 447). To these also may probably be added the opinion of the Arabian Averroes, who asserted that all men partake of one rational soul.<sup>g</sup> Or rather that the property of the individual was but a passive perception only, while the active energy was the product of a universal soul operating as the wind doth on an Æolian harp. (Leibniz, *Theodicée.*)

But the testimony of Scripture is express against Pantheism, as in Job; "Canst thou by searching find out GOD? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know?"<sup>h</sup> and again; "Great is our GOD

<sup>b</sup> Conc. Tolet. I. *ap.* Labbe, Tom. II. p. 1228.

<sup>c</sup> S. Leo P.P. I. Ep. 93, *ap.* Labbe, T. III. p. 1412.

<sup>d</sup> Ep. 190.

<sup>e</sup> Vasquez, in D. Tho. qu. 3, art. 8. Innocent III. thus summarily condemns this heretic: "Reprobamus etiam et condemnamus peruersissimum dogma impii Almarici, cujus mentem sic pater mendacii excæcavit, ut ejus doctrina non tam

hæretica quam insana sit censenda." Innocentius P.P. III. in Conc. Lateran. (A.D. 1215,) *ap.* Decretal. Tit. I. De Summa Trin. et Fide Catholica, cap. ii.

<sup>f</sup> S. Tho. Aquin. Summ. I. qu. 3, art. 8.

<sup>g</sup> Thomas Bradwardin. Archiep. Cantuar., De Causa Dei, Lib. I. Coroll. 36. Leibniz, *Theodicée.*

<sup>h</sup> Job xi. 7, 8.

above all gods. But who is able to build Him an house, seeing the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Him ?”<sup>i</sup>

Secondly, of  
the Unity of  
God.

§. 6. We come next to the Unity of GOD, whereby is understood “not generic or specific unity, which is the comprehension under the same conception of many which meet in the same genus or species; but numerical unity, whereby GOD is not only undivided in Himself and separate from everything else, but also His Essence is devoid of multiplication, so that He is sole and alone and beside Himself there is no GOD.”<sup>j</sup> The unity of GOD is not doubted by those who assent to Holy Scripture. “For He saith in the beginning of His legislation; ‘I am the LORD thy GOD, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods before Me.’<sup>k</sup> And again; ‘Hear, O Israel: The LORD our GOD is one LORD.’<sup>l</sup> And by the Prophet Isaiah; ‘I am the first, and I am the last; and beside Me there is no GOD. Before Me there was no GOD formed, neither shall there be after Me.’<sup>m</sup> And CHRIST in the Gospel thus saith to the FATHER; ‘And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true GOD.’<sup>n</sup> But with those who do not assent to Holy Scripture let us thus reason. The Deity is perfect and indefectible in respect of goodness and wisdom and power, without beginning, without end, eternal, uncircumscribed, and to speak absolutely in every respect perfect. If then we say there are many gods, we must needs contemplate difference in them. For if there be no difference in them, there is one GOD rather than many. But if there be difference in them; where is their perfection? For if He should fall short of the perfect in respect of goodness or of power or of wisdom or of time or of place, He would not be GOD. But identity throughout indicates one and not many. How shall the attribute of being uncircumscribed be preserved to gods many? For where one was, there the other would not be. And how should the world be governed by

<sup>i</sup> 2 Chron. ii. 5, 6.

<sup>j</sup> Limborch, L. ii. c. 3, §. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Deut. v. 6, 7.

<sup>l</sup> Jb. vi. 4. S. Mark xii. 29.

<sup>m</sup> Isa. xlii. 6; xliii. 10.

<sup>n</sup> S. John xvii. 3. Other passages which may be cited are 1 Kings viii. 23. Ps. xviii. 31. Hosea xiii. 4. 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6. Gal. iii. 20. Eph. iv. 6. 1 Tim. ii. 5.

many and not perish, when contention is seen to exist among the governors? For difference introduces opposition. But if you say, that each of them governs his department, who was it that ordained a distribution of offices among them? For He rather would be GOD. GOD therefore is One, perfect, uncircumscribed, the Maker, Preserver, and Governor of the Universe." °

§. 7. The Immutability of GOD is an incommunicable attribute, whereby His Essence is understood to be void of all corruption and alteration, and that He is ever like Himself, so that He cannot cease to be what He is nor begin to be what He is not.<sup>p</sup> It is affirmed in the Scriptures following; "But Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end."<sup>q</sup> "For I am the LORD, I change not."<sup>r</sup> "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."<sup>s</sup>

Thirdly, of  
His Immu-  
tability.

The immutability of GOD proceeds from His simplicity and unity; for a thing is said to be changed according to time and form, neither of which enters into the account of the Divine Essence. "There is," as Augustine saith, "a sole simple Good, and on this account only unchangeable, because it is GOD. By this Good were all things created good, but not simple; therefore changeable."<sup>t</sup>

If it be objected that at least the Generation of the WORD or SON of GOD and the Creation of the world indicate some change in the Nature of GOD, we reply that the former act is essential and eternal, hath never begun, doth never cease, and will never end; that the latter introduced a change of relation, not of nature. Thus Damascene: "In the case of the Generation of the SON, it is impious to say that time was a medium, or that the beginning of the SON's being begotten was after the FATHER: for we say that the Generation of the SON was of the FATHER's Nature. And if we do not grant that the SON co-existed with the FATHER, begotten of Him from

° S. Joan. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, Lib. i. c. 5.

<sup>p</sup> Scharpii Cursus Theol. Tom. I. p. 190.

<sup>q</sup> Ps. cii. 27.

<sup>r</sup> Malachi iii. 6.

<sup>s</sup> S. James i. 17.

<sup>t</sup> S. Aug. De Civ. Dei. L. xi. c. 10.

the beginning, we introduce by the way a change of the FATHER's substance, because (on that supposition) not being FATHER He afterwards became FATHER. For the Creation, even though it took place afterwards, yet was not of GOD's Essence, but was produced from not-being into existence by His will and power. And change doth not affect the nature of GOD: for generation is the producing that which is begotten out of the essence of him that begetteth; but creation is for that which is created to come into being externally and not of the essence of him that creates. In the case then of the Alone Immutable GOD, both the begetting and the creating is devoid of passion. For being by nature impassible and influxible, as being simple and incomposite, it is against His nature to endure passion or flux either in begetting or in creating, neither needeth He any co-operation. His Generation is without beginning and eternal, being a work of nature and proceeding from His Essence. He that begetteth undergoes no change, and is not GOD prior and GOD posterior, nor receives addition. But the creation, being a work of His will, is not co-eternal with GOD: since that which is produced from not-being into existence cannot in its nature be co-eternal with Him that is without beginning and ever is." \* I object to statements that, because GOD is of Himself sufficient in His Tri-une being, therefore "nothing accrues to Him," or that His gifts to man are granted merely "out of His desire of man's happiness." (Thornd. *Of the Covenant of Grace*, c. xxvi. §§. 2, 5.) For, though nothing accrues to the essence of GOD, the exercise of His attributes is His fulfilment of Himself, the welling out of His being, the expression of His Thought (the SON,) the spiration of His Love (the SPIRIT.). Nor may we assume that man's happiness is GOD's end, taking no account of the universe. We are safe when we keep to the words of Scripture, "For Thy glory they are and were created."

To those who will object the passions and affections attributed to GOD in Scripture we answer, that they are merely metaphorical representations of the Will of GOD in His relations with His creatures, accommodated to our ap-

\* S. Joan. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, L. i. c. 8.

prehension, and indicate no substantive change in His Nature.\*

§. 8. It may at first seem to require explanation, why the Eternity of GOD should need to be distinguished from His Immutability. The reason is this. "Immutability is the fulness of Essence itself, signified by the negation of change; but Eternity expresses something else, namely, duration and perseverance in essence. It adds also the negation of measure, which is not formally signified by Immutability. Eternity then is the immeasurable duration of GOD; but Immutability is the state of a thing full in its own being, a state admitting of no change." †

Fourthly, of His Eternity.

Eternity is one and indivisible and agrees alone with the Divine Nature, when taken in its full meaning; while Immutability would admit of being applied to a condition of participated Eternity in the case of an Angelic being.

Three things are included in our notion of GOD's Eternity; first, it excludes the thought of a beginning; secondly, that of succession and change; thirdly, that of ending.‡ The first and third points are thus touched by Nazianzen: "Immensities being regarded in a twofold manner according to beginning and end, when the mind looks into the deep above it, not having a standpoint for its fancies concerning GOD, that which it finds here immense and inextricable it terms Without beginning; but when it looks on things below and in succession, (it terms them) Immortal and Imperishable; and when it takes in the whole, Eternal. For an eternal age (*αἰὼν*) is neither time nor any portion of time, for it doth not even admit of measuring; but what to us is time measured by the sun's circuit, this to eternal beings is eternal age, that is co-extended with beings, like some motion and interval of time." §

To explain the distinction which is here implied, we may observe, that "Time is the duration and measure of things, whose being is subject to substantial change; of which kind

\* See Petavius, Dogmata Theol. T. I. L. iii. pp. 1, 2.

† Vasquez in D. Tho. Part I. qu. 10, art. 1. cap. 1.

‡ See Petavii Dogm. Theol. T. I. L. iii. c. 3. §. 6.

§ S. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. xxxviii. Tom. I. p. 616.



is all motion and also the essence of all corruptible things. Eternal age is the measure and duration of those things, which in their essence are immutable, but may be changed accidentally according to place and operations; of which kind are the heavens and intelligences. But Eternity is the duration and measure of something altogether immutable even accidentally; such is only the Divine Being.”<sup>a</sup> “The Eternity of GOD surpasses any perpetuity of age, in that it lacks succession, nor is it evolved by portions. For it hath no difference of past, present, or future; but consisting in a point and moment it knows not change or vicissitude.”<sup>a</sup> And so Boethius defines it as “the possession at once whole and perfect of interminable life.”<sup>b</sup> So also William of Paris: “Time is a continual irretainable flux, since its essence is to flow continuously and irretainably; Eternity on the contrary is continual and influxible stability. It is none other than the Being of the Creator or the Creator Himself; but that doth not say more of Eternity than declare its essence by the negation of beginning and ending.”<sup>c</sup> So also writes Dr. Jackson: “Eternity is a circular duration, whose instants are always, whose terminations or extremities never were, never shall be. It is co-existent to every parcel of time, but not circumscribable by any: succession infinite cannot be co-equal to it. \* \* Or, to speak as we think, it is impossible to conceive any duration to be without beginning and ending, without conceiving it circular and altogether void of succession. Notwithstanding, if any list to imagine time both ways everlasting; the continuity of it may be best conceived by the uninterrupted flux of an instant; and the stability of Eternity, by the retraction of such a perpetual flux into one durable or permanent instant.”<sup>d</sup>

Such is the mode of expounding Eternity adopted by Catholic Divines: but it is only fair to notice the objections of the Protestant Limborch. He says, “If we admit succes-

<sup>a</sup> Greg. de Valentia, in D. Tho. I. qu. 10, p. 145.

<sup>b</sup> Petavius, L. iii. c. 4. Tom. I. p. 138.

<sup>c</sup> De Consolatione Philosophiæ, Lib. v. Prosa 6.

<sup>d</sup> Guillelmus Parisiensis Episc., De Universo, Pars I. 2. Opp. foll. cxxxv, cxxxvii.

<sup>e</sup> Jackson's Works, Vol. II. pp. 35, 36.

sion in Eternity, we can hardly avoid acknowledging some first moment in Eternity, which is directly opposed to the notion of Eternity. \* \* But on the other hand also, if we remove all succession from Eternity, we say something incomprehensible. Since one cannot comprehend how a thing may endure eternally, unless there be in that duration a succession from one moment to another through intermediate moments." He then asserts contrary to the usual doctrine, that "Time consists of finite moments, Eternity of infinite; yea, Eternity seems really to be nothing else than Time without a beginning or end, and all finite Time a small portion only of Eternity." He lastly protests, that his object was not to determine that Eternity is successive duration, but to show that there are inexplicable difficulties on either side, and therefore that the mode of eternal duration is not to be rashly and imperiously defined.\*

The attribute under consideration is grounded on these texts: "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity:"<sup>f</sup> "the King eternal, immortal, invisible;"<sup>g</sup> "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto;"<sup>h</sup> "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the LORD, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the ALMIGHTY."<sup>i</sup>

It is scarcely necessary in conclusion to do more than barely notice the perverse opinions, which have sought to communicate the glorious attribute of Eternity to other than the ALMIGHTY. The most reasonable heresy is that of Origen, who held with the later Platonists the eternity of the world as an object-matter for the operations of Divine Power and Wisdom. If, indeed, it be 'heresy' to affirm what seems to be countenanced by Scripture, if not retrospectively, at least prospectively. (Isaiah lxv. 17, Rev. xxii.) Mohammed has adopted it. The heavens and earth were not made for instantaneous display, but GOD watches over His works *for eternity*. (*Korân*, p. 260.) The Valentinian doctrine of the emanation of Æons from the Godhead was a distortion of the

\* Limborch, L. ii. c. v. §§. 4, 5,  
10.  
<sup>f</sup> Isa. lvii. 15.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Tim. i. 17.  
<sup>h</sup> *Ibid.* vi. 16.  
<sup>i</sup> Rev. i. 8.

Catholic Verity concerning the Persons in the Sacred Trinity : while the height of absurd impiety seems to have been attained by the monastic followers of the Greek Palamas, who held that the light, which shone on Mount Tabor in the Transfiguration and was seen by the Apostles with their bodily eyes, was uncreate and co-eternal with GOD. And, if it is not superfluous to descend to the errors of individuals who had no followers, Augustinus Steuchus Eugubinus may be joined with them ; who thought that the empyreal Heaven was an eternal light, attending on Deity as light doth on the sun, yet distinct from It.<sup>1</sup>

Fifthly, of His Immensity or Omnipresence.

§. 9. Closely allied to the attribute of Eternity is that of GOD's Immensity or Omnipresence ; for as the former declares Him to exceed our conceptions of time, so does the latter proclaim Him unrestricted with regard to space.

Many texts of Scripture apply this attribute to GOD : " Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit ? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence ? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there : if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea ; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me." <sup>k</sup> " Am I a GOD at hand, saith the LORD, and not a GOD afar off ? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him ? saith the LORD. Do not I fill heaven and earth ? saith the Lord." <sup>l</sup>

A question is mooted, whether God is omnipresent virtually by reason of His power and providence, or really by reason of His Essence. I think it sufficient to cite one author only in support of the former position. S. Clement of Alexandria writes : " ' I am a GOD at hand, saith the LORD ' ; afar off indeed in Essence (He is), for how should the begotten be ever near the Unbegotten ? but most near in power, whereby all things are contained." <sup>m</sup> But this position is manifestly erroneous ; for GOD is simple in Essence, not composite nor made up of qualities ; so that where His Power is, there also must needs be His Essence, seeing It is whole and indiscerp-

<sup>1</sup> See Petavius, Tom. I. Lib. iii. cap. 5.

<sup>k</sup> Ps. cxxxix. 7-10.

<sup>l</sup> Jer. xxiii. 23, 24.

<sup>m</sup> S. Clem. Alex. Strom. L. ii. p. 264.

tible. Then, if we admit that GOD is omnipresent in Essence, we are met by two classes of thinkers. The first tells us that GOD is present everywhere like a point whole and indivisible. But this opinion involves Pantheism, and destroys the antecedent objection against idolatry; for how should not everything be divine, seeing the Divine Essence resides in or is it? and how can there be such a thing in reality as idolatry, seeing everything is divine? The second class, (of whom Vorst is a type, who succeeded Arminius in the Professorial Chair at Leyden in 1610,) maintains, that Omnipresence is by the mode of infinite extension. Yet even here we stand on perilous ground, for we seem thus to attach the idea of quantity to GOD. We see our way sufficiently to affirm many things; but not so as to remove the difficulties with which they are surrounded.

Two objections to the doctrine of GOD's Omnipresence may be briefly stated and answered.

First, if He be Omnipresent, we must allow what a religious nature will shrink from with instinctive horror, that He is present with evil and all its hideous and base accompaniments, even with Satan and his angels. To this it may be answered, that it is a part of human infirmity to seek to draw from the information, which Revelation supplies us with, consequences, which would be logical, if the object of our inquiries were of a piece with matters of everyday experience. And even granting the force of the objection, we may with S. Macarius<sup>a</sup> refer to the analogy of the sun's shining on the ungodly as well as the godly in proof of the Divine Majesty's remaining uninjured by the presumed contamination. "For Wisdom is more moving than any motion; she passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness."<sup>o</sup>

The second objection is, that Heaven is constantly called the 'habitation' of GOD in Scripture, as in the prayer of Solomon; "Hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling place,"<sup>p</sup> and especially in Our LORD's Prayer. But the objection, if valid, would go to prove the Divinity circumscribed by place

<sup>a</sup> Hom. vii. xv.

<sup>o</sup> Wisd. vii. 24.

<sup>p</sup> 1 Kings viii. 43.

and therefore finite; whereas Solomon distinctly saith, "Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee."<sup>a</sup> We must therefore interpret such expressions as condescensions to our infirmity, in order to lead us to form the purest, most exalted, and least material notions possible of the Majesty and Glory of God. In the same manner light and fire, being the purest substances we know of, are represented in connection with His appearances to men, as to Moses in the Burning Bush;<sup>r</sup> and to the Elders of Israel there appeared, "under His feet, as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness."<sup>s</sup>

Of the Communicable Attributes: first, of the Life of God.

§. 10. There are other attributes of GOD, which from their being shared in however imperfect a degree by men are called Communicable. No created nature is simple or incomposite or one or immutable or eternal or infinite; but it doth participate in life, and knowledge or wisdom, and will, and power, and the capacity of happiness. Of these Communicable Attributes, I propose to treat only of Life, and Wisdom, and Will; for where these three exist supremely complete in one Simple and Perfect Essence, Power and Beatitude are involved in their co-existence and union. Where there is perfect Life, there must be perfect Beatitude. For the notion of happiness consists in the full play and harmonious operations of the vital functions of a composite being, animal as well as intellectual. But in the case of the Divine Being, who is simple, impartible, and incomposite, the Unity of Essence excludes the possibility of defect or discord, and the perfection of His Life implies complete Beatitude. And so David addresses the ALMIGHTY; "Thou shalt make them drink of the river of Thy pleasures: for with Thee is the fountain of life."<sup>t</sup> So again with respect to Power; the union of perfect Wisdom and a supreme Will with the very source and fountain of Life supposes Omnipotence; for a sovereign Will, actuated by perfect Wisdom, and proceeding from the Life of life, lacks nothing; but in GOD to know and to will are not separate acts, as they are to our apprehension,

<sup>a</sup> *Ib.* viii. 27.

<sup>r</sup> *Exod.* iii. 2.

<sup>s</sup> *Ib.* xxiv. 10.

<sup>t</sup> *Ps.* xxxvi. 8, 9.

but indivisible generations of His perfect Life. Nor do the Scriptures pause to describe His operations; the expression of His Will is considered sufficient. "For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast."<sup>a</sup>

Life is attributed to GOD in Scripture sometimes simply in contradistinction to imaginary gods, as by S. Paul; "how ye turned to GOD from idols to serve the living and true GOD."<sup>v</sup> But this is only in an inferior sense. The real force of the attribute is to express our belief in GOD as the cause of life and being to all creatures. The attribution of Life is frequent and emphatic in the Bible: thus, "For I lift up My hand to heaven, and say, I live for ever."<sup>w</sup> "For as the FATHER hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the SON to have life in Himself."<sup>x</sup> And as He is Life Itself, so He is the cause of life to others. "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men."<sup>y</sup> "He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things."<sup>z</sup> "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things."<sup>a</sup>

§. 11. The next step to Life is Knowledge: for, to begin with our own experience, the first act of Life raised above the mere animal condition is the knowledge or consciousness which the living creature possesses of its own existence. And so in the Divine Nature the first act of GOD is the Knowledge of Himself, so to say; for, though there is no first or second or succession of acts in Him Who is Perfect and Simple and Incomposite, we are constrained to apply human conditions metaphorically to That which transcends our thoughts. Thus, S. Paul saith; "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him; even so the things of GOD knoweth no man, but the SPIRIT of GOD."<sup>b</sup> But as it has been before stated that there is no composition of substance and qualities in the simplicity of the Divine Essence, it follows that the Knowledge, Wisdom, Reason, or Word of GOD, His *Logos*, inheres in It, not as a quality, but as a Personal subsistency (*Πρόσωπον*). "Where shall wisdom be

Of the  
Knowledge  
or Wisdom  
of GOD.

<sup>a</sup> Ps. xxxiii. 9.

<sup>v</sup> 1 Thess. i. 9.

<sup>w</sup> Deut. xxxii. 40.

<sup>z</sup> S. John v. 26.

<sup>y</sup> Jb. i. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Acts xvii. 25.

<sup>z</sup> 2 Tim. vi. 13.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 11.

found? and where is the place of understanding? GOD understandeth the way thereof, and He knoweth the place thereof. For He looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven.”<sup>c</sup> Of this Personal Wisdom Solomon saith; “The LORD possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and my delights were with the sons of men.”<sup>d</sup> And S. Paul distinctly styles CHRIST, “the power of God, and the wisdom of GOD.”<sup>e</sup> And, because He is the author of reason which distinguishes man from the brute creatures and indicates the existence of soul, He is said by S. John to be “the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”<sup>f</sup>

I feel myself obliged here to anticipate what would properly come in, when we treat of the LOGOS or Second Person in the Blessed TRINITY; because the description of Divine Knowledge applies to Him strictly, and because He is the medium whereby we know the Fountain of Divinity. This will appear clearly, when the properties of Divine Knowledge shall have been shown. First then, It is not a quality of GOD or something adventitious to His substance, but His very substance Itself. “With us prudence and wisdom and counsel come and go as a habit, not however with GOD; for with GOD nothing comes and goes, as He is invariable and unchangeable, and we must not speak of accident in His case.”<sup>g</sup> Secondly, That Knowledge is not derived from its objects, but GOD knoweth all things in and by Himself and His own Nature. The consequence whereof is, thirdly, that His Knowledge is simple, not diverse and manifold as ours is: simple in nature, yet manifold in its operations. Fourthly, It is immutable, being the substance of GOD; and, fifthly, it is the cause of all things; for “in wisdom hast Thou

<sup>c</sup> Job xxviii. 12, 23, 24.

<sup>d</sup> Proverbs viii. 22, 23, 30, 31.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. i. 24.

<sup>f</sup> S. John i. 9.

<sup>g</sup> S. Jo. Damascen. De Orth.

Fide, L. i. c. 14.

made them all" saith the Psalmist;<sup>b</sup> and "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made."<sup>1</sup>

The knowledge of God as extending to all creation is involved in the title of 'Maker of all things,' but may be illustrated by His Providence in regard to Man the chief of all His works; so that what is found to apply to the greater will the more forcibly cover the lesser class. The LORD searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts."<sup>1</sup> "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? I the LORD search the heart, and I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings."<sup>k</sup>

It was the opinion of Averroes, that "the knowledge of God is not universal; because universal knowledge imports power in respect of single items; and there is no power in His knowledge, as he supposes; nor is it particular, as he argues, because particulars are infinite, and not determined by knowledge."<sup>1</sup> The same sophistry is also attributed, but uncertainly, to Aristotle.<sup>m</sup> The whole of Revelation supplies a direct negative to this. For not only is God "a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart,"<sup>n</sup> but "He telleth the number of the stars; He calleth them all by their names."<sup>o</sup> His Providence descends to the fowls of the air and the lilies of the field; His "Wisdom reacheth from one end to another mightily: and sweetly doth she order all things;"<sup>p</sup> "neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with Whom we have to do."<sup>r</sup>

More wisely than his brother-philosopher doth Avicenna show that nothing comes to pass by chance but by Divine providence, saying; "You cannot tell what comes to

<sup>b</sup> Ps. civ. 24.

<sup>1</sup> S. John i. 3.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

<sup>k</sup> Jer. xviii. 9, 10. See 1 Sam. xxi. 7. Ps. vii. 9; cxxxix. 23, 24. Rom. viii. 27.

<sup>1</sup> Bradwardin. De Causa Dei, Lib. i. cap. 7, p. 185.

<sup>m</sup> See Vasquez, in D. Tho. qu. xiv. art. 6. Greg. De Valentia, qu. xiv. punct. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Heb. iv. 12.

<sup>o</sup> Ps. cxlvii. 4.

<sup>p</sup> S. Matt. vi. 26, 28, 30.

<sup>q</sup> Wisd. viii. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Heb. iv. 13.



pass by chance, because reason induces you to judge that all things proceed from government and disposition. For you should know that God's care of them arises from this; namely, that He first knoweth Himself, and that from Himself is the necessity of ordaining good, and that His Essence is the cause of goodness and perfection, as things admit of it and as it pleaseth Him."<sup>\*</sup> "For God knoweth all things," saith Clement of Alexandria, "not only those that are, but also those that shall be, and as everything shall be; and foreseeing their particular motions, He overseeth and heareth all things, and hath through eternity the thought of each particular; \* \* for He seeth all things collectively and particularly at one glance."<sup>†</sup>

As the Nature of GOD is simple, not admitting of variation or succession of parts or of separate consciousnesses, it follows that His Knowledge embraces all things without distinction of Past, Present, or Future. Not that His Knowledge contradicts the successive and fragmentary knowledge, which alone is compatible with the capacity of creatures limited by time and space, but that It infinitely surpasses it. He "calleth those things which be not as though they were" saith S. Paul;<sup>‡</sup> not as though they really co-existed with Him from eternity, for then we should be admitting not only the eternity of matter but also of all material as well as intellectual forms, which is absurd; but as existing in idea and possibility in the Eternal Mind, not in actual operation.

The foreknowledge of GOD is in itself simple, nor doth it vary according to its object-matter. But as we cannot treat of it at all without borrowing from our own experience, it receives in the language of the Schools different names, according as our intellect takes in notions of future things. For things future are classed, first, as *necessary*, such as not only proceed from a natural cause and determined to one object, but also cannot be hindered by any natural opposition of causes, as the sun's rising, eclipses, and the like; secondly, as *possible or contingent*, such as either seem to us to admit of

<sup>\*</sup> Bradwardin. Lib. i. cap. 9, p. 192.

<sup>†</sup> S. Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. vi. p. 498.

<sup>‡</sup> Rom. iv. 17.

proceeding from any free or natural cause but also may be hindered by a like cause, as the occurrence of atmospheric changes, rains, diseases, and the like; or such as depend more immediately and evidently on freewill, as many human actions.\*

In speaking then of the Divine Knowledge, it is termed *the knowledge of simple intelligence*, that is, of truths possible and necessary, even of infinite worlds not brought into existence. It is also called *the knowledge of vision*, that is, of actual existing truths, past, present, and future, even of the world as created. A third mode is also proposed, namely, God's knowledge of things contingent but never to take place, which conditionally would take place some time or other; although neither the condition itself nor its consequence is in any wise to take place.†

The instances of this *Scientia Media* given from Scripture are these. First, God foretold to David that the men of Keilah would deliver him into the hands of Saul: which however did not take place, for David being warned of God saved himself by retiring from Keilah.\* Secondly, God foretold to king Zedekiah by His Prophet Jeremiah, that, if he went forth to the king of Babylon's princes, the Jews should not deliver him into their hands nor mock him: which also never took place.† But these instances are not well put, for they relate to God's knowledge of the present though secret purposes of men rather than to things future. But a clear instance of prescience is afforded by the woe denounced by Our LORD on Chorazin and Bethsaida, because that they sinned under conditions, which, had the same been offered to Tyre and Sidon, would have produced repentance in those sinners of ancient time: a saying, which can only be referred to the Prescience and Omniscience of God.\* For an exhaustive account of these intricate questions, see Thorndike, *Of the Covenant of Grace*, ch. xxiv., *Just Weights*, ch. xii. 9.

\* See Vasquez, in D. Tho. qu. xiv. art. 13, cap. 1.

† See Petavius, *Dogmata Theol.* Lib. iv. cap. 8. The Jesuit Molina first introduced this *Scientia Media*

into the Schools in his book *De Concordia Gratiae et Liberi Arbitrii*.

\* 1 Sam. xxiii. 10—13.

† Jer. xxxviii. 17—20.

\* S. Matt. xi. 21. See Limborch, Lib. ii. cap. 8, §. 29.

Of the Doctrine of Archetypal Ideas.

§. 12. Closely connected with the present subject is the doctrine of Ideas ; and, as it has to a great extent affected Theological speculations about the Divine Nature, it cannot properly be omitted here. As Plato has generally the reputation of having invented the term, we must seek for an explanation of its primary meaning in his writings. Regarding all things as in a state of change, he argued that there must be somewhere an enduring type and pattern of what was so imperfectly developed in the visible universe : “ that there is the species that possesses identity, that is unbegotten and imperishable, that neither admits into itself aught from elsewhere nor itself enters into something else in any direction, but is invisible and otherwise beyond sense ; namely, That which thought only can perceive.”<sup>a</sup> These forms or ideas he considered distinct from the Divine Essence ; and his follower Philo went a step further, and thought that, as an architect draws his plans before he attempts the actual building of any structure, so GOD created these types or ideas before He created the material world.<sup>b</sup> Elsewhere, he speaks of these Ideas, as the Rabbins do of the *Sephiroth*. Moses is introduced as thus addressing GOD ; “ But I consider Thy glory to be the powers that attend Thee, the comprehension of which up to the present escaping me causes no small longing for to know them.” And GOD answers ; “ The powers which thou seekest after are invisible, and objects of intellect in every sense, as belonging to Me the Invisible and Intelligible.”<sup>c</sup> From the Platonic school this phraseology was brought into the Christian Church ; and from the time of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite downward it became usual to designate certain abstract forms or ideas, *αὐτοεἶναι*, *αὐτοζωή*, *αὐτοσοφία*, *αὐτοαγαθότης*, *αὐτοδικαιοσύνη*, and so forth ; the writers who do so not intending to express any concrete separate entities, but simply the Divine Essence, as being Itself very Being, Life, Wisdom, Goodness, Righteousness. If the Gnostics made these Ideas to be constituent members of the Divine PLEROMA, we need not, with Thorndike, charge

<sup>a</sup> Plato in *Timæo*, § 26 Ed. Bekk.

<sup>b</sup> Philo, *De Mundi Opificio*, T. I. p. 4. Ed. Mangey.

<sup>c</sup> *De Monarchia*, T. II. p. 218.

Plato and Pythagoras with 'familiarity with unclean spirits.' (Works, Bk. III. c. xxvi. p. 621.)

It is necessary then to show what passages of Scripture seem to approach this doctrine of Ideas. Moses was permitted to see by some miraculous means the Divine Ideas, of which the tabernacle service was but a shadow and a transcript. "Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount."<sup>d</sup> And S. Paul supplies the comment on the text: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."<sup>e</sup> Now as the Divine Essence excludes the notion of divisible thoughts and ideas from its perfect Unity and Simplicity, it follows that there is but one Idea, one Reason in GOD, Which is none other than the SON by Whom the FATHER "made the worlds; being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His Person, and upholding all things by the word of His power."<sup>f</sup> "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made."<sup>g</sup> In Him therefore as the Personal Image of the unseen FATHER, by whom the Godhead manifests Itself in operation, converge all created intelligences as in their True Archetypal Idea; for "in Him was life; and the life was the light of men."<sup>h</sup> He is "that perfect Word, to Whom nothing is wanting, and a certain Art of the Almighty and Wise GOD, full of all living and immutable reasons; and all things are one in Him, as He is One in Him with Whom He is One. In Him GOD knoweth all things which He made by Him; and therefore when times come and go, nothing comes or goes from the knowledge of GOD. For these things that are created are not therefore known of GOD, because they are made; rather are therefore made, because they are immutably known by Him."<sup>i</sup>

§. 13. Another internal act of the Divine Life is the Will of GOD; which in reality, as in man, doth not differ from the Intellect or Knowledge, but is apprehended by us under a

Of the Will  
of God.

<sup>d</sup> Ex. xxv. 40.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. ix. 23.

<sup>f</sup> 1b. i. 3

<sup>g</sup> S. John i. 3.

<sup>h</sup> 1b. i. 4.

<sup>i</sup> S. Aug. De Trinitate, Lib. vi. cap. 10, Tom. VIII. p. 850.

distinct conception, because it tends towards its object considered in a different manner. The term 'Will' of God is used in Scripture in three senses: first, for the faculty or internal act of willing, wherein it is identical with the Divine Essence Itself, which by reason of Its simplicity excludes any notion of divisible faculties; secondly, for the act of willing or volition itself, which is the free egress of the faculty, whereby are declared the Divine decrees or manifestations of God's Essential and secret Will; and thirdly, the recorded expressions of that Will in precepts, promises, and threatenings.

A commodious manner of considering the Will of God is the distinction employed by Peter Lombard<sup>1</sup> of *Voluntas beneplaciti* or the secret Will, which is the internal action of God, whereby He willeth anything; and *Voluntas signi* or the Revealed Will, whereby He showeth by some outward indication that He willeth anything. Of these, the first is never unfulfilled; but the latter is not always fulfilled. The examples of Abraham's being commanded to slay his son and the revocation of the original order is cited as a case in point; but surely with little judgment or discretion, for it is expressly said that "God did tempt Abraham."<sup>2</sup> And to introduce anything like contradiction or change into God's Will would be to run counter to His attribute of Immutability; especially when we consider that the internal act of His secret Will is really identical with His Essence. I think it sounder Theology to accept the distinction in this sense only, wherein God doth not reveal all that He wills and decrees but conceals a portion. So Moses saith; "The secret things belong unto the LORD our GOD: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law."<sup>3</sup> And S. Paul speaks of "the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, Who created all things by JESUS CHRIST: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God."<sup>4</sup>

This gradual development of God's Will does not imply

<sup>1</sup> 1 Sent. Dist. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Deut. xxix. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Eph. iii. 9, 10.

any substantive change; for what was hidden from the people, whose hearts were too carnal to receive the things of the SPIRIT, was yet revealed to the Prophets, as Amos saith; "Surely the LORD GOD will do nothing, but He revealeth His secrets unto His servants the Prophets. The lion hath roared, who will not fear? the LORD GOD hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"<sup>a</sup> But it would seem that the completer knowledge of God's Will was a source of mysterious suffering even to the Prophets themselves, until their wills were subdued by the overpowering influence of the Divine SPIRIT. For Jeremiah saith; "O LORD, Thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived: Thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am in derision daily, every one mocketh me. \* \* Then I said, I will not make mention of Him, nor speak any more in His Name. But His Word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing and I could not stay."<sup>o</sup>

Another mode of considering the Divine Will is that adopted by Damascene, (following Chrysostom in Ep. ad Ephes. Hom. i.,) namely, as the First or *Antecedent*, and the Second or *Consequent* Will. The First is that, whereby God of Himself willeth anything without any consideration of circumstances, whereby it is said that He "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."<sup>p</sup> The Second or Consequent Will is that, whereby God willeth anything, not by or according to itself, but with a view to circumstances; the contrary whereof He would will, were not the circumstances as they are.<sup>q</sup> The First emanates from the goodness of God, and is conditional; the Second embraces justice as well as mercy, taking account of Man's free will, and is absolute. Thus Damascene: "But you should know that God antecedently willeth all men to be saved and to obtain His kingdom; for it was not for to punish us that He created us but to partake of His goodness, inasmuch as He is good; but when we sin He willeth us to be punished, inasmuch as He is just. The first then is called (His) antece-

<sup>a</sup> Amos iii. 7, 8.

<sup>o</sup> Jer. xx. 7, 9.

<sup>p</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 3.

<sup>q</sup> See Petavius, Dogm. Theol. Lib. v. c. 4. §. 15; and Limborch, L. ii. c. 9. §. 20.

dent will and good pleasure, being of Him ; but the second (His) subsequent will and permission, being of our causation. And this (permission) is double ; the one dispensative and corrective with a view to our salvation, the other damnatory with a view to complete punishment. But these things belong to what is not in our power ; but of what is in our power He antecedently willeth and is pleased with the good, but the wicked and really evil portion He willeth neither antecedently nor subsequently but permitteth to our free will.”<sup>r</sup> This distinction of the antecedent and consequent Will of GOD is much insisted on by Leibniz in his *Théodicée*. I doubt not but he would say that, though GOD willeth not evil *morally*, He willeth it *metaphysically*, in that He foreseeeth its existence necessary to the better plan of His universe, and thereon pronounceth His creative Fiat.

There are other Attributes of GOD, borrowed from human affections, which are to be understood in a transcendental sense when applied to the Divinity. Their proper limitation of meaning will be best understood, when their use is checked by reference to the Incommunicable Attributes. They may generally be reduced to the present head, namely, the Will of GOD. Thus, the Love of GOD is the affection wherewith He willeth what is good and delighteth therein : “ And GOD saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good.”<sup>s</sup> And, in particular, His Love to Man may be distinguished in two ways ; first, as the antecedent or Love of Benevolence, and secondly, as the subsequent or Love of Friendship. The first is that affection and goodwill wherewith GOD regards all men, in so far as they are His creatures, without regard to whether they are worthy of it or not. “ For so GOD loved the world, that He gave His only begotten SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”<sup>t</sup> “ Herein is love, not that we loved GOD, but that He loved us, and sent His SON, to be the propitiation for our sins.”<sup>a</sup> Of this Love there are two subdivisions, Grace and Mercy. Grace is the affection of doing good to men who are unworthy of the love of GOD, and is

<sup>r</sup> De Orth. Fide, cap. 46.

<sup>s</sup> Gen. i. 31.

<sup>t</sup> S. John iii. 16.

<sup>a</sup> 1 S. John iv. 10.

always opposed to merit: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the Gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."<sup>v</sup> "And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace."<sup>v</sup> Mercy is the affection of a ready will wherewith GOD bringeth aid to the afflicted: "Is Ephraim My dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore My bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the LORD."<sup>z</sup> The love of Friendship is not only a simple affection, but also goodwill wherewith GOD is actuated toward His creature, when it fulfils its duty as such; and loves him in return. "He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me; and he that loveth Me shall be loved of My FATHER, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him."<sup>y</sup> I cannot forbear citing the words of a Catholic layman, whose deep sense of the Love of GOD may help to correct the dryness of a scholastic discussion of this kind. His love then is "a thing most delicate, yielding a kind of ethereal felicity, a pleasure for which there is not a name, resembling that which is inspired by the presence of one beloved and venerated, or by looking at the pale blue over the mountains of a western horizon on a fine summer's morning,—a theme sweet and felicitous beyond the infinity of thought." (Kenelm Henry Digby, *Evenings on the Thames*, Vol. II. p. 516.)

The attribution of Hatred and Anger to the Deity arises from the object-matter that we are dealing with, while so attributing, being in its very conception a privation of what we have already positively affirmed of Him; as may be seen from these texts: "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness."<sup>z</sup> "He that believeth on the SON hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the SON shall not see life; but the wrath of GOD abideth on him."<sup>a</sup> The Desire, Hope, Joy, Aversion, Fear, Affliction, Justice, Truth, Long-Suffering, Forbearance, and Severity of GOD are only modifi-

<sup>v</sup> Eph. ii. 8, 9.

<sup>v</sup> Rom. xi. 6.

<sup>z</sup> Jer. xxxi. 20.

<sup>y</sup> S. John xiv. 21.

<sup>a</sup> Ps. xlv. 7.

<sup>a</sup> S. John iii. 36.



cations of our conceptions of His Will, according as it has been revealed to us :<sup>b</sup> and the Omnipotence and Glory and Beatitude are as it were the complement and overflowings of His incommunicable Attributes, whereby we labour to shadow forth His Essence.

Of the  
Names of  
God.

§. 14. It remains that we should examine briefly the Names, which are applied to God in Holy Scripture. First and pre-eminent stands the ineffable Name יהוה *Jehovah*, by contraction יה *Jah*; which from its consisting of four Hebrew letters was termed *Tetragrammaton*. The Jews held it in such reverence, that they thought it neither ought nor could be pronounced; nor are we certain to this day about its true pronunciation. It is called by the Jews the *Schem hamphorasch*, the expounded Name, because it clearly indicates the Essence of GOD.<sup>c</sup> It is expressed in Greek by the form Ὁ ὢν, the Self-Existent, and fully paraphrased by S. John in the Apocalypse as "Which is, and which was, and which is to come."<sup>d</sup> The Greeks had learnt to write the Name Ἰαὼ, or, to keep the four letters, Ἰαοὺ and Ἰεωά.<sup>e</sup> This Name denotes the Essence or τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι of GOD, and is introduced in Scripture with peculiar solemnity. "And GOD spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the LORD: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the Name of GOD Almighty, but by My Name JEHOVAH was I not known to them."<sup>f</sup> That is, as Aben Ezra expounds it, I made Myself known to them and showed that I am *Schaddai*, that is, the Strong or Sufficient, by governing and helping them. But I did not indicate to them My Name יהוה, because, although they had heard and knew it, yet were they ignorant of its force. For they had not learnt that I was so named, because 'I am that I am' or 'I will be that I will be.'<sup>g</sup> So the meaning of the Name *Jehovah* is likewise conveyed in that of *Ehjah ascher Ehjah*, I will be that I will

<sup>b</sup> Ps. lxxxi. 13. Lam. iii. 44. Isa. v. 2. Deut. xxx. 9; xxxii. 27. Isa. lxiii. 10. Deut. xxxii. 4. Rom. iii. 4. Heb. x. 23. Ezek. xxxiii. 11. Rom. ii. 4. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15, 16.

<sup>c</sup> Maimonides, More Nevochim, I. c. 61.

<sup>d</sup> Rev. i. 4.

<sup>e</sup> Ἀτὰρ καὶ τὸ τετραγράμμιον ὄνομα τὸ μυστικόν, ὃ περιέκειτο οἷς λόγοις τὸ ἄδυντον βᾶσιμον ἦν· λέγεται δὲ Ἰαὼ, ὃ μεθερμηνεύεται ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐσόμενος. S. Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. v. p. 410.

<sup>f</sup> Exod. vi. 2, 3.

<sup>g</sup> Petav. Dogm. Theol. I. Lib. viii. c. 9. §. 7.

be; I AM THAT I AM.<sup>b</sup> Limborch labours to prove that its meaning is, that GOD is constant to His promises; and that it is applied to Angels, as in Exodus xxiii. 20, 21, and in Genesis xviii. But the Catholic Church believes that a deeper mystery lies hid in those passages.<sup>1</sup>

The second Name is *Elohim* in the plural, and sometimes in the singular *Eloahh*, signifying 'judges' or persons placed in exalted position. It is applied not only to GOD, but also to angels and even to human governors, as in the Psalm; "I have said, Ye are gods."<sup>2</sup> A favourite illustration of the doctrine of the TRINITY is borrowed from the use of this plural term coupled with the singular JEHOVAH in the Book of Genesis and elsewhere. Limborch again sets about the ungrateful task of depriving Orthodoxy of this support, as well as of the passage, "Let us make man."<sup>3</sup> He refers to the style of dignity employed by kings; but it may be replied that the idea of supreme Majesty is best expressed by a severe simplicity, as for instance, 'I am Pharaoh;' and that the Church hath ever used 'Thou' and not 'You' in her addresses to GOD.<sup>4</sup>

The third Name is *Adonai*, rendered by the Septuagint *Kύριος* and sometimes *Δεσπότης*, signifying 'LORD,' and adopted conventionally as a substitute for the incommunicable Name *Jehovah*. It is applied to GOD as being in a sovereign sense LORD of all things; and is still attributed by the Latin Church to the Second Person.<sup>m</sup>

The fourth Name is *El*, rendered *Θεός* by the Seventy. It is also a name of dignity, and is applied to angels and to men who excel in power; as, "Who is like unto Thee, O LORD, among the gods?"<sup>n</sup>

The fifth Name is *El Schaddai*, translated by Aquila *ἀλκιμος*, by the Seventy *παντοκράτωρ*, sometimes *ικανός*,

<sup>b</sup> Exod. iii. 14.

<sup>1</sup> For instance, our Church reads Gen. xviii. as an Evening Second Lesson on Trinity Sunday, because it has been traditionally held to apply to a manifestation of the Second Person in the Blessed TRINITY.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. lxxxii. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. i. 26.

<sup>4</sup> See Limborch, Lib. ii. c. 1. §. 11.

<sup>m</sup> "O Adonai, et dux domus Israel, qui Moysi in igne flammæ rubi apparuisti, et ei in Sina legem dedisti: veni ad redimendum nos in brachio extento." Antiphona, Die 18 Dec. in Breviario Romano.

<sup>n</sup> Exod. xv. 11.

sometimes *Kýrios*, signifies 'the All Sufficient or All Mighty'; and, when written with  $\text{יהוה}$ , it is believed not to be attributed to any creature in Holy Scripture.

The sixth Name is *Sabaoth*, the LORD of Hosts, as in the Psalm; "Who is this King of glory? The LORD of Hosts, He is the King of glory."<sup>o</sup>

Lastly, the two Greek names, which occur in the New Testament, are *Θεός*, derived either from *θέω* or *τίθημι*, I dispose, or from *θέω*, I run, or else from *θεάομαι*, I behold; all metaphors expressing the human conception of the Ruler of the Universe: and *Kýrios*, which designates GOD as LORD of all by way of eminence, and is applied in a peculiar sense to CHRIST as being by right of redemption the LORD of His elect people the Church.<sup>p</sup>

Chemnitz well observes, that Dionysius the Areopagite (so called), "when about to say something of GOD, entered on no bad way, when he collected the appellations attributed to GOD in Scripture. But Platonising over much he disturbs the simplicity of the fishermen, and has afforded occasion to posterity for many idle speculations."<sup>q</sup> I may add that the religious recital of these sacred Names and Attributes in our devotions tends to heighten our faith, and to prevent it by GOD's blessing from degenerating into a bare intellectual speculation concerning abstractions.

<sup>o</sup> Ps. xxiv. 10. This name was also retained in the Latin Church, as in the Gallican Sacramentary at the conclusion of the Mass: "Tu summe Deus, aīos (*āyios*), Ipse sanctus, omnipotens Sabaoth, qui venisti ab excelsis pati pro nobis,

miserere nobis." Sacrament. Gallic. *apud* Mabillon., Museum Italicum Tom. I. p. 281.

<sup>p</sup> See S. Hieronym. Ep. 136, *ad Marcellam*.

<sup>q</sup> Martinus Chemnitius, *Loci Theologici*, Part I. p. 28.

## CHAPTER V.

## OF THE HOLY TRINITY.

§. 1. BEFORE we examine in detail the most sacred Doctrine of the TRINITY, it is well first to prefix the Church's authoritative statement thereof. "We worship" "one GOD, one LORD; not one only Person, but three Persons in one Substance:"<sup>r</sup> "one GOD in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the FATHER, another of the SON, and another of the HOLY GHOST. But the Godhead of the FATHER, of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal."<sup>s</sup> "For that which we believe of the glory of the FATHER, the same we believe of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST, without any difference or inequality."<sup>t</sup> "As we are compelled by the Christian verity, to acknowledge every Person by Himself to be GOD and LORD; so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords," or "three eternal," or "three incomprehensibles," or "three uncreated," or "three Almightyes." "The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten. The SON is of the FATHER alone: not made, nor created, but begotten. The HOLY GHOST is of the FATHER and of the SON: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." "And in this TRINITY none is afore, or after other: none is greater or less than another; but the whole Three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal."<sup>u</sup>

Statement  
of the Do-  
ctrine.

<sup>r</sup> Communion Office, Book of Common Prayer.

<sup>s</sup> Creed of S. Athanasius.

<sup>t</sup> Com. Office, Preface on the Feast of Trinity.

<sup>u</sup> Creed of S. Athanasius. See

General  
Scripture  
Proof.

§. 2. The importance of this great Doctrine may be gathered from the fact, that when Our LORD sent His Apostles forth with a commission to preach the Gospel He charged them to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST."<sup>v</sup> This then, and not the doctrine of the Incarnation or of the Atonement or of the Resurrection or of Justification, is the very pith and kernel of the Gospel. Those blessed truths, however valuable they be, are involved in the central Verity of the Blessed TRINITY. And this was generally acknowledged in ancient times both by orthodox and heretic. Thus we read in the Second Arian Creed of Sirmium; "The summary of the entire Faith and its security is, that the TRINITY be ever held, as we have read in the Gospel;" and they finish the quotation from S. Matthew.<sup>w</sup> And S. Jerome speaks of expounding the doctrine of the TRINITY as tantamount to teaching the whole Creed. "But there is a custom," he says, "of this sort with us, that throughout the Forty Days we should expound publicly the doctrine of the holy TRINITY to those who are to be baptized."<sup>x</sup>

The Scripture testimonies, on which the doctrine rests, are derived chiefly from the New Testament; the reason whereof will be explained hereafter. I have already cited the most illustrious passage, to which should be added others which involve mention of the TRINITY in a few words. "But when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the FATHER, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the FATHER, He shall testify of Me."<sup>y</sup> "But if the SPIRIT of Him that raised up JESUS from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up CHRIST from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His SPIRIT that dwelleth in you."<sup>z</sup> "And because ye are sons, GOD hath sent forth the SPIRIT of His SON into your hearts, crying, Abba, FATHER."<sup>a</sup>

With diffidence I add the controverted passage; "For

also a clear statement of the Faith in the Corpus Juris Canonici, De Summa Trinitate, cap. 1; and in the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Summa Trinitate, c. 2.

<sup>v</sup> S. Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>w</sup> Labbe, Conc. Tom. II. p. 788.

<sup>z</sup> S. Hieronym. Ep. 61. ad Pamachium, Tom. I. p. 215.

<sup>y</sup> S. John xv. 26.

<sup>z</sup> Rom. viii. 11.

<sup>a</sup> Gal. iv. 6.

there are three that bear record in heaven, the FATHER, the WORD, and the HOLY GHOST; and these three are one.”<sup>b</sup> I say “with diffidence” because its genuineness is questioned; it being supposed from its too direct testimony to have been fabricated by some of those injudicious Christians, who in the fourth century published the Divine Hierarchy of Dionysius the Areopagite and similar works with the hope of benefiting the cause of Orthodoxy. But it may be doubted at least whether the assumed benefit is so obvious; for the passage in question might easily be perverted to a Sabellian sense. And the testimony of S. Jerome is deserving of respect; who, in the Prologue to the Canonical Epistles, complains of unfaithful translators omitting it in their editions.<sup>c</sup>

§. 3. The revelation of the TRINITY has been compared to the gradual process of illumination which attends the sun-rising. First one flush of light, then another, till at last appears above the horizon the sun itself in full-orbed splendour. This accords with S. Paul’s statement, that CHRIST “hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.”<sup>d</sup> “The Old Testament proclaimed the FATHER clearly, the SON more obscurely: the New manifested the SON and indicated the Divinity of the HOLY SPIRIT. The SPIRIT dwelleth among us at present, making His manifestation more evident to us. For it was not safe, while the Divinity of the FATHER was not yet acknowledged, that the SON should be clearly proclaimed; nor, while that of the SON was not received, that the HOLY SPIRIT should (to use a bold expression) be imposed on us.”<sup>e</sup> “One Deity,” says Epipha-

Indications  
of it in the  
Old Testa-  
ment. Its  
gradual Re-  
velation.

<sup>b</sup> 1 S. John v. 7.

<sup>c</sup> That it was known in Africa long before the time of Arius is proved by the following passages of Tertullian and Cyprian: “‘Ceterum de Meo sumet,’ inquit, sicut Ipse de Patris. Ita connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paraclete, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero, qui *tres unum sunt*, non unus, quo modo dictum est, ‘Ego et Pater unum sumus.’” (Adversus Praxeam, cap. 25.) “Et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est: ‘*Et hi tres unum sunt.*’” (S.

Cyp. in Lib. de Unitate Ecclesiae.) Again, wishing to prove that persons baptized by heretics could not be the temple of GOD, he writes; “Quæro, cujus Dei? . . . Si Spiritus Sancti, *cum tres unum sint*, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est?” (Id. in Epist. ad Jubaianum.) See Mabillon. in Appendice ad Liturgiam Gallicanam, pp. 476, 7.

<sup>d</sup> 2 Tim. i. 10.

<sup>e</sup> S. Gregor. Nazianzen, Orat. xxxvii. Opp. Tom. I. p. 608.

nus, "is announced in Moses, and a duality (of Persons) is diligently proclaimed in the Prophets, and a TRINITY is manifested in the Gospels, according to times and generations more and more befitting the righteous man with a view to knowledge and faith. This knowledge is of immortality, and springs from faith itself or adoption. But first it expresses the justifications" (or good works, *δικαιώματα*) "of the flesh, raising as it were the outer enclosure of the temple in Moses; secondly, it expounds those of the soul, adorning as it were the holy place in the other Prophecies; thirdly, those of the spirit, arranging as it were the mercy-seat and the holy of holies for its own abiding-place in the Gospel writings."<sup>f</sup> And S. Isidore of Pelusium gives the reason of this gradual unfolding of the truth; namely, that GOD "legislating for the Jews who inclined to polytheism did not think it meet to introduce a difference of Persons, lest dogmatising that there was a different nature in the Persons they should fall into idolatry; but that, having learned from the commencement the doctrine of the Unity, (*τῆς μοναρχίας*) they might next learn by degrees the doctrine of the Persons, which comes back again into the Unity of Nature."<sup>g</sup>

The passages of the Old Testament, which supply indications of a TRINITY of Persons in the Godhead, and admit of being urged in argument against Jews and Sabellians, are the following.

"And GOD said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."<sup>h</sup> If, as some of the Jews, and among Christians Marcellus of Ancyra, supposed, this was addressed by GOD to Himself, it bears the mark of a puerile and otiose saying: if, on the contrary it refers to the Creator's consulting with His Angels, as Aben-Ezra and Maimonides<sup>i</sup> together with the old Saturnilian heretics<sup>j</sup> imagined, it is made to contradict plain testimonies of Scripture, as; "Who hath directed the SPIRIT of the LORD, or being His counsellor hath taught Him? With whom took He counsel, and who instructed

<sup>f</sup> S. Epiph. Adv. Hæreses, lxxiv. num. 10. Tom. I. p. 899.

<sup>g</sup> S. Isidorus Pelusiota, Lib ii. Ep. 143.

<sup>h</sup> Gen i. 26.

<sup>i</sup> More Nev. L. ii. cap. 6.

<sup>j</sup> Epiph. Hæres. xxiii.

Him?"<sup>k</sup> Again; "And the LORD GOD said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."<sup>l</sup> If, as Aben-Ezra thinks, GOD here addresses angels, we reply that there can be no equality between GOD and Angels; for there must be equality in such an expression as "one of us:" if, as R. Selomoh says, He addresses Himself, the words "one of us" still require plurality in the subject which they designate, to make sense of them. The language used by the ALMIGHTY in declaring His intention of confounding the speech of the builders of the tower of Babel, "Go to, let us go down and there confound their language,"<sup>m</sup> may be mentioned, but with a slightly less emphasis. For although some, as Augustine,<sup>n</sup> have thought it might refer to angels as ministers of GOD's will; yet angels are not mentioned in the passage, whereas elsewhere we find that they are, when they are introduced as the court of Heaven.<sup>o</sup> Again; "Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven."<sup>p</sup> This is all but universally regarded by Catholics as expressing the action of the WORD or SON of GOD, Who "hath declared" Him Whom "no man hath seen at any time." And although Chrysostom<sup>q</sup> appears to concur with the Jews in explaining it by referring to the Hebrew mode of repeating a proper name instead of the pronoun,<sup>r</sup> I think the parallel infelicitous. For the speech of Lamech is a kind of sententious verse or poem, which would allow of redundancy for poetical purposes; not so in the example under consideration. Two other passages have been ever in high veneration with Catholic Christians, though they are easily evaded by Jews; the one, "By the Word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth:"<sup>s</sup> the other; "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of Hosts."<sup>t</sup> We may add two more: "And GOD said unto him, Call her name Lo-ruhamah: for I will no more have mercy upon the

<sup>k</sup> Isa. xl. 13, 14.<sup>l</sup> Gen. iii. 22.<sup>m</sup> Gen. xi. 7.<sup>n</sup> De Civitate Dei. Lib. xvi. c. 6.<sup>o</sup> See 1 Kings xxii. 19. Job i.

6. Isa. vi. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Gen. xix. 24.<sup>q</sup> Hom. 43 in Gen.<sup>r</sup> Gen. iv. 23.<sup>s</sup> Ps. xxxiii. 6.<sup>t</sup> Isa. vi. 3.



house of Israel ; but I will utterly take them away. But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the LORD their GOD."<sup>u</sup> "And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan ; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee."<sup>v</sup>

The Psalms are rich in testimonies against Sabellian error ; particularly we should notice the passages cited therefrom in the New Testament. As, "The LORD said unto my LORD, Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool."<sup>w</sup> Our LORD quoted this to the Pharisees as referring to MESSIAH without fear of contradiction ; for "no man was able to answer Him a word."<sup>x</sup> And, "The LORD hath said unto Me, Thou art My SON ; this day have I begotten Thee."<sup>y</sup> This S. Paul in like manner applied to JESUS the MESSIAH, while preaching in a synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia ; which he would not have done if that application were not admitted.<sup>z</sup> Lastly, "Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever : the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness : therefore GOD, Thy GOD, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows."<sup>a</sup> This again is by S. Paul expressly applied "to the SON."<sup>b</sup>

From these testimonies S. Isidore of Pelusium concludes, that "the Old Testament proclaims the supremacy, not of One Person, but of Three Persons (*ὑποστάσεων*), yet One Essence ; that it might condemn the Jews' unsound idea as of One Person ; (whom Sabellius also followed, having summoned courage "from the exceeding equality of the SON with the FATHER, to teach as dogma the One Person ;) and to banish the polytheism of the Greeks, whose disciples Arius and Eunomius have been detected to be, in that contrary to reason they violently introduce the difference of Persons into the Essence, for to suppose different natures is Greekish," (*Ἑλληνικόν*, that is, Pagan ;) "and (to suppose) one Person or one Subsistency, Jewish ; but to expand the Persons into the HOLY TRINITY and bring them together into One Essence, is a most right and true dogma."<sup>c</sup> This state-

<sup>u</sup> Hosea i. 6, 7.

<sup>v</sup> Zech. iii. 2.

<sup>w</sup> Ps. cx. 1.

<sup>x</sup> S. Matt. xxii. 43.

<sup>y</sup> Ps. ii. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Acts xiii. 33.

<sup>a</sup> Ps. xlv. 6, 7.

<sup>b</sup> Heb. i. 8.

<sup>c</sup> S. Isidorus Pelusiota, *ubi supra*.

ment of Isidore as to Arius's re-introducing Paganism struck the late Dean Stanley as something *new*, when told of it by Dr. J. B. Mozley: he talks of the "mythological elements which would have been introduced into theology by the notion of an exalted *Æon*, Angel, &c. as advocated by Arius." (Mozley's *Letters*, p. 241.)

§. 4. To proceed to a theological exposition of what the Church means by the terms which she employs in her application of the above Scripture texts, I will borrow the words of Aquinas as an admirable statement of what the ancient Divines have delivered in either too prolix or too rhetorical a manner. "Holy Scripture," he says, "in relation to GOD uses names pertaining to procession. But this procession different men have taken in different ways. For some have understood it according as an effect proceeds from a cause. And so Arius took it, saying that the SON proceedeth from the FATHER, as His first creature, and that the HOLY SPIRIT proceeded from the FATHER and the SON, as the creature of both. And according to this, neither the SON nor the HOLY SPIRIT would be Very GOD; which is contrary to that which is said of the SON, 'And we know that the SON of GOD is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His SON JESUS CHRIST. This is the true GOD, and eternal life';<sup>d</sup> and of the HOLY GHOST it is said, 'Know ye not that your body is the temple of the HOLY GHOST which is in you?'<sup>e</sup> but to have a temple belongeth to GOD alone. Others have taken this procession, according as a cause is said to proceed into effect, as far as it produces the effect, or impresses its similitude on it. And so Sabellius took it, saying, that GOD the FATHER Himself is called SON, according as He assumed flesh of the Virgin: and he saith that the same is the HOLY GHOST, according as He sanctifies the rational creature, and quickens it. But to this acceptation the words of the LORD are repugnant, saying of Himself, 'The SON can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the FATHER do;'<sup>f</sup> and many other passages, whereby is shown that the FATHER Himself is not

The Processions in the Divine Essence.

<sup>d</sup> 1 S. John v. 20.

<sup>f</sup> S. John v. 19.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 19.

the same as the SON. But if any one diligently considers, Sabellius and Arius understood procession, as it relates to something external. Whence neither placed procession in GOD Himself. But since every procession pertains to some action; as an external procession pertains to an action which tends to outward matter, so a certain internal procession waits on an action which remains in the agent himself. And this is most of all evident in the intellect, whose action, namely, to understand, remains in the person that understands. But from this very circumstance of understanding proceeds something within himself, which is a conception of the thing understood, arising from the intellective power and proceeding from the knowledge of it. Which conception indeed the voice signifies; and that which is signified by the vocal word is called the word of the heart. But since GOD is above all things, those expressions in the case of GOD are not to be understood suitably to the lowest creatures, which are Bodies, but to the highest, which are Intellectual Substances; from whom even a borrowed similitude fails to represent things Divine. Procession then is not to be taken according to that which obtains in things corporal either by local motion or by the action of some cause to an outward effect, as heat from a heating agent to something that is heated; but according to an intelligible emanation, as of a word intelligible by the person who utters it, which remains in himself. And thus the Catholic faith determines Procession in things Divine.”\*

Terms employed to express them; Hypostases, Persons, Trinity.

§. 5. The terms, which the Church has employed to designate these internal and substantive Processions in the Divine Essence, have undergone considerable fluctuation. For, while the Eastern Church was constrained by Sabellian error to adopt the term *Hypostasis* in the plural to mark the unconfused and real distinction of the SON and HOLY GHOST from the FATHER, the novelty did not readily commend itself to Latin ears, accustomed to the familiar interchange of *Hypostasis* and *Usia* in secular life. It was felt that to confess three *Hypostases* or *Subsistencies* in the Godhead seemed like an acknowledgment of three Gods, or to give colour

\* S. Tho. Summ. i. qu. 27, art. 1.

at least to the Arian impiety of affirming one GOD even the FATHER, and two similar but unequal Emanations, to wit, the SON and the HOLY GHOST. Thus S. Jerome appears to have suspected the confession of three separate natures in the nomenclature of Three *Hypostases*, for he says: "The whole school of secular literature knows nothing else as *hypostasis* unless *usia*. And who, I pray, will with sacrilegious mouth proclaim three *substances*? There is One and only Nature of GOD, which truly is: for that which subsists hath not from elsewhere, but is its own."<sup>b</sup> The Council of Alexandria (A.D. 362,) at which S. Athanasius and Eusebius of Vercellæ assisted, wisely moderated between the conflicting usages. But it is important to observe, that, if a novel phraseology was allowed to pass current with the safeguard of an explanation, it was so much gained to the stock of theological terms; and, when once admitted, could not afterwards be easily dislodged from its vantage-ground. The Council elicited from the assertors of the One *Hypostasis*, that they employed the phrase, because they understood the term to mean the same as *οὐσία* (Essence or Substance,) and not with any Sabellian leanings. The answer of the assertors of the Three *Hypostases* was to the effect, that "they neither spoke of three Gods or three Principles, nor at all endured those who said or thought this, but acknowledged a HOLY TRINITY indeed yet one Godhead; one Principle (of Divinity), and the SON Consubstantial with the FATHER, as the Fathers said" (i.e. the Nicene Synod;) "and the HOLY GHOST, not a creature, nor yet foreign, but proper to and inseparable from the essence of the SON and of the FATHER."<sup>1</sup>

The terminology of the Three *Hypostases* receives authoritative confirmation by its adoption in the Synodical Epistle of

<sup>b</sup> S. Hieron. Ep. 57, ad Damasum. Socrates confirms this fact concerning the secular use of the term *Hypostasis* as equivalent to *Usia*. "Εἰρηναῖος δὲ ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῷ κατὰ στοιχείον Ἀττικιστῇ καὶ βάρβαρον ἀποκαλεῖ τὴν λέξιν· μὴ δὲ γὰρ παρὰ τισὶ τῶν παλαιῶν εἰρησθαι. εἰ δὲ πον καὶ ἡδῆται, μὴ ταῦτα σημαίνειν, ἐφ' ὧν νῦν παραλαμβάνεται. Παρὰ υἱὸν γὰρ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Φοῖνικι ἐνέδραν σημαί-

νειν τὴν ὑπόστασιν παρὰ δὲ Μενάνδρῳ, τὰ καρυκεύματα ὡς εἰ τις λέγοι τὴν ἐν τῷ πίθῳ τοῦ οἴνου τρύγα ὑπόστασιν. Ἰστέον μέντοι, ὅτι εἰ καὶ οἱ παλαιοὶ φιλόσοφοι τὴν λέξιν παρέλιπον, ἀλλ' ὅμως οἱ νεώτεροι τῶν φιλοσόφων συνεχῶς αὐτὴ τῆς οὐσίας τῇ λέξει τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἀπεχρήσαντο." (Hist. Ecoles. L. iii. c. 7.)

<sup>1</sup> Labbe, T. ii. p. 814.

the First General Council of Constantinople to the Synod of the West; for they speak of the Gospel Faith, as "most ancient and consequent to Baptism, and that teacheth us to believe in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST; evidently inasmuch as one Godhead and power and essence is believed of the FATHER and of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST, the dignity equal, the kingdom co-eternal, in Three perfect Hypostases or in Three perfect Persons."<sup>1</sup> Facundus bishop of Hermiana affirms that the use of the term 'Persons' came in vogue in the course of the Sabellian controversy; but, as that term would occasion no inconvenience to that class of heretics, provided the separate subsistency of the Persons were not dwelt upon, it seems more probable that it antedates that period, and that the term '*Hypostases*' or '*Subsistencies*' was the real test applied to the heterodox opinions.<sup>2</sup> It must also be observed, that, while the term *Hypostases* has been found susceptible of an Arian interpretation, that of *Persons* (προσώπα) from its well-known etymology may easily be perverted to a Sabellian meaning.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to assign the exact period, when the term *Τρίας* came to be generally used in the Greek Church; though it seems probable that, as Alexandria witnessed the closest alliance of Platonism with the Faith, it was borrowed from the school of Philo by those Christians who evinced such zeal in reconciling Philosophy with the Gospel. The earliest occurrence thereof is in the work of Theophilus bishop of Antioch, (A.D. 168;) but the passage is by no means satisfactory.<sup>1</sup> The corresponding Latin term *Trinitas* is found in Tertullian for the first time; but it is almost needless to add, that that is no proof that he was the first who employed it.<sup>2</sup>

§. 6. To revert again to the Divine Processions, which we

<sup>1</sup> *Apud* Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. L. v. c. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Petavius, Dogm. Theol. L. iv. c. 4. §. 9.

<sup>1</sup> "Ἐσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι τῶν φωστῆρων γεγονυῖαι τύποι εἰσιν τῆς τριάδος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ

καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ." (S. Theoph. ad Autolyicum, Lib. ii. p. 94.)

<sup>2</sup> "Nam et Ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est Spiritus, in quo est Trinitas unius Divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus." (Tert. De Pudicitia, c. xxi. p. 574.)

understand by the term *Trinity*; it must be remarked, that, as the simplicity and excellence of the GODHEAD excludes the usual account given of Relations, namely, that they are founded on quantity or on action and passion, it remains that “real relations in GOD cannot be taken except according to actions, by which there is an internal procession in GOD and not external. But there are only two processions of this sort: whereof one is understood according to the action of the intellect, which is the procession of reason; the other according to the action of the will, which is the procession of love. But according to either procession we must needs understand two opposite relations; whereof one should be that of one proceeding from a principle, and the other that of the principle itself. The procession of the WORD is called Generation according to the proper reason whereby it is competent to living things. Now the relation of the principle of generation in perfect living things is called Paternity; and that of one proceeding from a principle is called Sonship; but the procession of love hath no proper name, whence the relations, which are understood according to it, also have none. But the relation of the principle of this procession is called Spiration, and the relation of him that proceeds, Procession; although these two names pertain to the processions themselves and not to the relations.”<sup>a</sup>

Of the Relations and Notions of the Holy Trinity.

These Relations guide us to distinguish Persons in the GODHEAD; and, when contemplated in connection with that consequence, are termed *Notions*. A Notion is defined by Aquinas following S. Augustine to be ‘that which is the proper reason of knowing a Divine Person.’<sup>o</sup> Of which kind he will have to be five; Unbegottenness, Paternity, Sonship, Common Spiration which they call Active Spiration, and Procession which is called Passive Spiration.<sup>p</sup> Of which he observes that the four last are Relations; and that three are *Personal Relations*, which constitute so many Persons; and they are, Paternity, Sonship, Procession: the remaining two are called *Notions of Persons*, not Personal Relations, because

<sup>a</sup> S. Thom. Summ. I. qu. 23, art. 4.

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid.* I. qu. 32, art. 3.

<sup>p</sup> They are thus called in Greek; ἀγεννησ α. πατρότης, υἱότης, προβολή, ἐκπόρευσις.

Persons do not consist of them, although they regard the understanding of them; and they are, Unbegottenness and Spiration or *προβολή*.<sup>a</sup>

Distinctions  
and Unity  
in the God-  
head. The  
Circum-  
cession.

§. 7. This distinction yet unity of the GODHEAD is called by the Greeks *ἡνωμένη καὶ διακεκριμένη Θεολογία*, and is thus eloquently expounded by Damascene. "When I consider one of the *Hypostases*, I know It to be perfect GOD, perfect Essence: when I connect and enumerate the Three together, I know One perfect GOD; for the GODHEAD is not something composite, but One perfect indivisible and incomposite in Three perfect (Persons). But when I consider the relation of the *Hypostases* to each other, I know that the FATHER is a super-essential sun (*ὑπερούσιος ἥλιος*), the fountain of goodness, abyss of essence, reason, wisdom, power, light, GODHEAD; the fountain that generates and puts forth the good hidden in it. He indeed is Intellect, the abyss of reason, the Begetter of the WORD and Who through the WORD putteth forth the interpreting Spirit; and, in short, the FATHER hath no reason, wisdom, power, will, except the SON; Who is the Sole Power of the FATHER, that began the making of all things, begotten as a perfect Person of a perfect Person, as He Himself knoweth, Who both is and is called SON. And the HOLY GHOST (is) the Power of the FATHER that declares the mystery of the Godhead, proceeding from the FATHER through the SON, as He Himself knoweth, not by way of generation; wherefore also the HOLY GHOST perfects the making of all things. As many terms as suit the Cause, Father, Fountain, Begetter, we must attach to the FATHER Alone; and as many as suit the Caused, Begotten, SON, WORD, Originating Power, Will, Wisdom, we must apply to the SON; and as many as suit the Caused, Proceeding, Interpreting, Perfecting Power, we must apply to the HOLY GHOST. The FATHER is the Fountain and Cause of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST, but FATHER of the SON alone and putter forth of the HOLY GHOST. The SON is the SON, Reason, Wisdom and Power, Image, Reflexion (*ἀπαύγασμα*), Impress (*χαρακτήρ*) of the FATHER. And the HOLY GHOST is from the FATHER, but not SON of the FATHER, the SPIRIT of the FATHER, as proceeding from

<sup>a</sup> Petavius, iv. in *proæmio*.

the FATHER, (for there is not a single impulse (*ὁρμή*) without the SPIRIT,) and (He is) the SPIRIT of the SON, not as from Him, but as proceeding from the FATHER through Him, for the FATHER Alone is the Cause." <sup>r</sup>

Petavius remarks on the wonderful consequence of the distinction of Persons in the Godhead, that so far is it from hindering the unity and simplicity of GOD, that this very same real difference of Persons makes most of all for the sublime Unity and absence of composition in the Divine Nature. For unless there were so great a distinction between the Persons, or if there were but one only Person of GOD, wherein there should be mere and simple operations of intelligence and will, which should produce no *substantive term* (as they call it), that is, no *Hypostasis*, GOD would in that case not be one or simple, but composite.\* And S. Athanasius writes to the same purpose; "For, if He (that is, the WORD) were not essential Wisdom and substantial WORD and existing SON (*καὶ ὢν Τὸς*), but simply Wisdom and WORD and SON in the FATHER, the FATHER Himself would be composed of Wisdom and WORD (*σύνθετος ἐκ σοφίας καὶ λόγου*)."<sup>r</sup>

This wonderful co-existence of Three distinct Persons in One Essence is explained (as far as it may be) by the Greek term *περιχώρησις*, which is rendered into Latin as *Circumincessio* or *Circuminsessio*. By it is meant the existence and presence of the Persons in one another by reason of their identity of Nature and Essence." (See Bull, *Defens. Fid. Nicænæ*, L. IV. c. iv. §§. 10, 14.) For, as Damascene writes, "We cannot speak of local distance in the case of the uncircumscribed Godhead, as we can in our own: for the Persons are in each other, not so as to be confused, but so as to inhere, according to the word of the LORD Who said, 'Believe Me that I am in the FATHER and the FATHER in Me.'"<sup>v</sup> Nor can

<sup>r</sup> S. Joan. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, cap. 13.

<sup>\*</sup> Petavius, Lib. ii. c. 4. §. 8.

<sup>v</sup> S. Athanas. Contra Arianos Orat. v. *circa initium*. Opp. T. I. p. 520.

<sup>\*</sup> The orthodoxy of the term is somewhat impaired by the impertinent introduction of categories, where they are obviously improper.

Thus a Scholastic Divine defines Circuminsession: "Circuminsessio quidditative formaliterque consistit in presentia intima et inseparabili atque perpetua secundum immensum *ubi*." Ruis. D. 107. De Trin. Sect. 7. N. 9. Petavius, Tom. ii. L. iv. c. 16, §. 3.

<sup>v</sup> S. John xiv. 11



we speak of difference of will, or of judgment, or of operation, or of power, or of aught else; which things beget in us the practical and complete distinction. Wherefore also we do not say that the FATHER and the SON and the HOLY GHOST are three Gods, but rather One GOD the HOLY TRINITY; the SON and SPIRIT being referred to One Cause, not composed, nor commingled, according to the comprehension of Sabellius (*συνυλπεσιν*); for they are united, as we said, not so as to be confused, but so as to inhere in one another. And they have their *circumincession* in one another without any commixture or confusion; neither emanating or essentially sundered, according to Arius's division (*διαίρεσιν*); for the Godhead is inseparable in separate (Persons); and as in three suns close to one another and inseparable, the blending and cohesion of light is one." <sup>w</sup> I must here remark that both Damascene and Petavius are more successful in riddling the explanations offered by the heretics than in solving the Insoluble; as may be seen by the poor device of pretending the unity of the *blended* light of three *parhelia*. The pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite instances the fused light of torches in a room, in a passage which Bull calls 'splendid;' say rather, a struggle to express a thought too big for utterance. Observe, how the pseudo-Ambrose and Fulgentius, "semi-barbarous writers of the fourth century," raise a mist of words. (Bull, *Defens. Fid. Nic.* IV. c. iv. §. 13.) The *circumincession* is still 'the deepest and darkest corner' of theology. (Gibbon, *Decl. and Fall* &c. ch. xxi.) "Then thought I to understand this, but it was too hard for me." (Ps. lxxiii. 15.)

Special At-  
tributes of  
the Three  
Persons.

§. 8. Albeit that the Unity of the Divine Essence secures the application of the attributes to each of the Three Persons alike, yet it is observed that Power is especially appropriated to the FATHER, Wisdom to the SON, and Goodness to the HOLY GHOST; together with the operations attendant on these attributes, Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification. These distinctions are founded on Holy Scripture. Thus CHRIST Himself saith of the FATHER, "All things are deli-

<sup>w</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. De Orthod. Fide, cap. 8.

vered unto Me of My FATHER ;”<sup>a</sup> and he prayed to Him, saying, “ Abba FATHER, all things are possible unto Thee.”<sup>b</sup> And S. Paul calls Him “ the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and LORD of lords ; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto ; whom no man hath seen, nor can see : to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.”<sup>c</sup> And in the Creed, we profess to believe in “ GOD the FATHER Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth ;” wherein we see not only omnipotence but also the work of Creation peculiarly ascribed to the FATHER.

The reason why omnipotence is thus appropriated to the FATHER is, because He is the origin and principle not only of all created things but also of the Divine Persons. And since Power agrees better with the individuality of FATHER, it is peculiarly ascribed to Him. And as the Divine Power shines forth chiefly in the work of the creation of the whole world, Creation is appropriated to Him. Besides the FATHER being the First of the Divine Persons and the origin of the others, the work of Creation, being the foundation of the rest, namely, Redemption and Sanctification, is suitable to Him.

Wisdom is appropriated to the SON by Himself in the Gospel. For whereas in S. Luke He is represented saying, “ Therefore also said the Wisdom of GOD, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute,”<sup>a</sup> in S. Matthew He saith the same of Himself in the first person singular.<sup>b</sup> S. Paul also calls Him “ the Wisdom of GOD,”<sup>c</sup> and saith that “ in Him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.”<sup>d</sup> The reason of this attribution is evident from the fact, that the SON is born of the FATHER, as a word or thought is the conception of the mind. As the SON according to the form of GOD was from everlasting the intermediate Person between the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST, even as a word is between the mind and love ; so it became Him in the fulness of time to become a

<sup>a</sup> S. Matt. xi. 27.

<sup>b</sup> S. Mark xiv. 36.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.

<sup>d</sup> S. Luke xi. 49.

<sup>b</sup> S. Matt. xxiii. 34.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Cor. i. 24.

<sup>d</sup> Col. ii. 3.

Mediator between GOD and Man by the assumption of Humanity. The FATHER had created the world "in Wisdom,"\* for "all things were made by Him;"<sup>f</sup> and so it was fitting that He Who was the immediate Agent in Creation should be employed in the reparation of His own marred work by the process of Redemption.

Thirdly, Goodness is peculiarly ascribed to the HOLY GHOST. The propriety of this attribution is not so evident from any direct text of Canonical Scripture as from the force of many concurrent passages. Thus, the chief acts of CHRIST in the work of our Redemption are said to be done through the Spirit; as, His conception,<sup>g</sup> His miracles of mercy,<sup>h</sup> His oblation on the cross,<sup>i</sup> and His resurrection.<sup>j</sup> And the affluence of the gifts of GOD to men is also ascribed to the SPIRIT.<sup>k</sup> The reason whereof is, that the SPIRIT proceeds after the manner of love. For since He is the Third Person in the Trinity proceeding from the other Two, in Whom the procession stops and in a manner rests, He is rightly compared to love; to which the mind indeed proceeds by knowing, but from which it does not advance further, being contented with the delight itself of loving. But that love is the proper work of goodness is plain. Whence also it is evident why sanctification and beatification are peculiarly attributed to the HOLY GHOST. For sanctification is the work of especial love. But beatification is the last work of GOD, to which the preceding works of creation and redemption are destined. For therefore were men first created and then redeemed, that they might at length arrive at beatitude.<sup>l</sup> Our being is from the Father; our rationality from the Word; our renewing from the Spirit; yet the Three Persons participate in Their respective actions.

The view here set forth receives confirmation from the antithesis of evil, which we observe in the Baptismal renuncia-

\* Ps. civ. 24.

<sup>f</sup> S. John i. 3.

<sup>g</sup> S. Luke i. 35.

<sup>h</sup> S. Matt. xii. 28.

<sup>i</sup> Heb. ix. 14.

<sup>j</sup> Rom. viii. 11.

<sup>k</sup> Isaiah xi. 2. Joel ii. 28. S.

John vii. 38; xiv. 16; xvi. 13. Acts ii. 4. 1 Cor. xii. 4—11. Titus iii. 5—7.

<sup>l</sup> See Estius in I. Sent. Dist. xxxiv. §§. 3, 4, 5. Durand. I. Dist. xxxi. qu. 3.

tion. In Baptism we are called upon to "renounce the devil and all his works; the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same; and the carnal desires of the flesh;" and the Church prays that the baptized may "triumph against the devil, the world, and the flesh." The devil is represented in Scripture as aiming at power especially, because it is the sovereign attribute of the FATHER. Thus he is called "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience;"<sup>m</sup> CHRIST sends His Apostle Paul to turn the Gentiles "from the power of Satan unto God;"<sup>n</sup> and He, even the FATHER, is said to have "delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of His dear SON."<sup>o</sup>

Again, the world and its wisdom is opposed to the SON and WORD of GOD. "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not."<sup>p</sup> "For after that in the wisdom of GOD the world by wisdom knew not GOD, it pleased GOD by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of GOD."<sup>q</sup> "But GOD forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."<sup>r</sup>

Lastly, the flesh and its lust is opposed to the SPIRIT of GOD and His pure influence: for the flesh lusteth against the SPIRIT, and the SPIRIT against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."<sup>s</sup> And the reason of this opposition is, that the SPIRIT is the Love of the FATHER and of the SON; while lust or the perversion of desire is said to be according to the flesh, when the impulses of our will are not controlled and elevated by our spirit or higher nature, but are subject to the flesh or the material portion. It is remarkable that the French traveller, M. Paul Marcoy, found on the river Amazon

<sup>m</sup> Eph. ii. 2.  
<sup>n</sup> Acts xxvi. 18.  
<sup>o</sup> Col. i. 13.  
<sup>p</sup> S. John i. 10.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Cor. i. 21, 18.  
<sup>r</sup> Gal. vi. 14.  
<sup>s</sup> Gal. v. 17.

a tribe of Indians who acknowledged a God-creator, a God-preserver, and a Spirit of love and intelligence; and another, the Mesayas, whose God had three attributes, power, intelligence, and love.

Illustrations  
of the Doc-  
trine of the  
Trinity.

§. 9. The ancient Fathers have used many similitudes derived from material substances to illustrate the manner of the Divine Processions. And there was the greater necessity for diligence in this particular, because the heathen polytheism and the Valentinian notions concerning the Divine *Æons* presented points of resemblance at first sight to the cavillers or the inattentive. I know of no passage so clear in its illustration on this head as the following of Tertullian. "Valentinus," he says, "discriminates his Processions and separates them from their Author; and puts them so far from Him, that the *Æon* knows not his Father. In fine, he longs to know Him and cannot; yea, and he is almost swallowed up and dissolved into his remaining substance. But with us the SON alone knows the FATHER, and Himself hath declared Him, and hath heard and seen all things with Him; and what He hath been charged by the FATHER, that also He speaks. Neither hath He fulfilled His own but His FATHER's will, which He knew from the highest, yea, from the beginning. For who knoweth what is in GOD, except the SPIRIT Which is in Him? But the WORD is furnished with the SPIRIT, and, so to say, the SPIRIT is the body of the WORD. The WORD then is both ever in the FATHER, as He saith, 'I am in the FATHER;'<sup>t</sup> and ever with GOD, as it is written, 'And the WORD was with GOD;'<sup>u</sup> and never separate from the FATHER; for 'I and the FATHER are one.'<sup>v</sup> The SON hath proceeded from the FATHER, not separated. For GOD produced the WORD, as a root doth a tree, as a well a river, as the sun a beam. For they too proceed from those substances out of which they issue. Nor should I hesitate to call the tree the child of the root, the river of the well, the ray of the sun; because every source is a parent, and everything that is produced from a source is a progeny: much more so is the WORD of GOD, Who properly hath received the name of SON. Yet

<sup>t</sup> S. John x. 38.

<sup>v</sup> S. John x. 30.

<sup>u</sup> S. John i. 1.

neither is the tree separated from the root, nor the river from the well, nor the ray from the sun, as the WORD also is not (separated) from GOD. Therefore according to the manner of these examples I say (there are) two, GOD and His WORD, the FATHER and His SON. For both the root and tree are two things, but conjoined. And the well and river are two kinds, but undivided. And the sun and ray are two forms, but coherent. Everything that proceeds from something else must needs be second to that from which it proceeds, yet it is not on that account separate. Thus the TRINITY, descending from the FATHER through harmonious and connected grades, offers no opposition to the Unity (*monarchia*) and protects the condition of the Dispensation (*œconomice statum*)."<sup>w</sup>

S. Augustine supplies us with yet another illustration of the TRINITY of a higher kind, borrowed from man's introspection of his own nature. "And we indeed," he writes, "recognise in ourselves an image of GOD, that is, of that highest TRINITY, although not an equal one, yea, exceedingly remote; nor co-eternal, nor of the same substance whereof GOD is, yet than which nothing is by nature nearer GOD among the things made by Him; one still to be perfected by reformation, that it may also be most near in resemblance. For we both are, and know that we are, and love that being and knowing. But in these three which I said, no falsehood resembling truth disturbs us. For we do not touch them by any bodily sense, as we do things which are without: as in seeing colours, in hearing sounds, in smelling odours, in tasting savours, in handling hard and soft things we feel; of which sensible things even the images most like them and no longer corporeal we turn over in thought, retain in memory, and through them are roused to desire the former: but without any play of the imagination it is most certain to me that I am, and that I know and am pleased therewith."<sup>x</sup>

§. 10. Two errors of a directly opposite character, affecting the doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY, should be here noticed. The principal tenet of Arianism, as it affirms the Divinity of the SON but denies His coessential relation to the FATHER,

Errors to be avoided.

<sup>w</sup> Tertull. Adv. Praxeam, cap. 8.

<sup>x</sup> S. Aug. De Civ. Dei, Lib. xi. c. 26, Tom. VII. p. 292.

involves the further position of three unequal grades in the TRINITY. This is emphatically denied in the Athanasian Creed, where we say : " And in this TRINITY none is afore or after other ; none is greater or less than another ; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal." S. Epiphanius distinctly charges Origen with being the precursor of Arianism, wherein he is followed by Aquinas. " From him both Arius took his pretexts, and those who succeeded, the Anomœans and others. For he saith, daring forsooth to say at the outset, that the Only-Begotten SON cannot see the FATHER, nor can the SPIRIT behold the SON, nor angels the SPIRIT, nor men angels. And this is his first fall ; for he brings Him out of the essence of the FATHER, and at the same time makes Him to be created. And he will have it that He is called the SON according to grace." †

To expose the error in its full deformity, I subjoin Eusebius's account of it : " In this way therefore are we to understand the world of incorporeal and intellectual essences ; the ineffable and immense power of the GOD of all summarily comprehending all things, and next after the FATHER the at the same time creative and illuminative power of the Divine WORD. Wherefore also it is usual with the Hebrews to call Him both True Light and Sun of Righteousness. And third now, after the second Essence, *being set in the place of the Moon*, the HOLY GHOST ; Whom also Himself they class in the first and royal dignity and honour of the government of all things ; Himself also being appointed by the Maker of all things to rule things inferior and needing to be supplied by Him. But He, holding the third rank, supplies His best gifts to inferior beings ; yea, He too in His turn receives from another, to wit, from GOD the WORD, Who is higher and superior, Whom we pronounced to be second to the highest and unbegotten nature of God the Sovereign of all. From Whom certainly GOD the WORD himself also being supplied, and as it were drawing from a perennial well bubbling up with Divinity, collectively and bountifully imparts the splendours of His own light to all alike, and assuredly also to the HOLY GHOST Himself being more than all nearest

† S. Epiph. Adv. Hær. (xliii. *Origenianorum*,) Tom. I. p. 527.

to Him; and next to Him, to the intellectual and divine powers.”<sup>a</sup>

§. 11. Here I cannot but marvel that Limborch should have adopted apparently as his own what he chooses to call “the ingenuous confession” of Petavius concerning the subordination of the SON and SPIRIT to the FATHER.\* Petavius’s object was to show in what loose and unsatisfactory language the Ante-Nicene Fathers expressed themselves on this important subject. His words are: “Both those” (namely Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, Tertullian, and Lactantius,) “as well as others, as Origen, thought the FATHER to be superior in age, dignity, and power to the WORD; and although they asserted the SON to be of the FATHER’s substance or nature, wherein alone they made His condition different from the rest, which are called proper creatures; still they thought Him to have had a beginning no less than creatures, that is, by no means to have been a distinct *Hypostasis* from eternity.”<sup>b</sup> Then with the same affected regard for Scripture alone, which the ancient heretics always pretended, Limborch quietly dismisses all the experience of the Christian Church on the subject, saying; “We have followed the simplicity of Scripture, and purposely abstained from those words and phrases, because they were invented by men, and that in the heat of contentions, and were unknown to the first Fathers.”<sup>c</sup>

Of the subordination of the Son and Spirit.

But the real subordination of the Persons, which the Catholic Faith tolerates, is that only which secures the order in which they are revealed to us in Scripture against the innovations of an idle or wanton fancy. The pre-eminence of the FATHER is established by the fact, that the *Hypostases* of the SON and SPIRIT are revealed to us as Processions from the First Person; Who, in that He is the First, is the very fountain and origin of Godhead. Yet are the SON and SPIRIT co-equal with Him in all things, in that they are internal and co-eternal Processions of His Essence. “The privilege of

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. *Præparat. Evang. Lib.* vii. cap. 15, p. 325.

<sup>c</sup> Limborch, *Theol. Christiana*, Lib. ii. cap. 17, §. 26.

<sup>b</sup> Petavius, *Dogm. Theol. Tom.* II. L. i. c. 5, §. 7.

<sup>c</sup> §. 28.



being the fountain of the Godhead, which is of necessity proper to the FATHER alone, importeth that which the SON and the HOLY GHOST cannot have. They have the Godhead not 'from Themselves,' and it is necessarily more 'to give than to receive.' They are something of His, His SON and His SPIRIT, though the same GOD also nevertheless." (Thornd. *Of the Covenant of Grace*, ch. xvii. §. 8.) It is enough for a believer to observe the order which Scripture prescribes; though a pious and sufficient reason thereof has been given, namely that it took its origin from our relation to the TRINITY; since in receiving gifts we first meet the Dispenser of them, then we consider Him Who sent Him, then we lift our thought to the Fountain and Cause of good things.<sup>d</sup> So in the great work of our Redemption, the FATHER is revealed as the ultimate motive cause; "So GOD loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."<sup>e</sup> And while the Son, as the Wisdom of GOD, took our flesh to accomplish the design of His FATHER, it was not done without the co-operation of Eternal Love, Who assisted at the Sacrifice. "How much more shall the Blood of CHRIST, Who through the eternal SPIRIT offered Himself without spot to GOD, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living GOD?"<sup>f</sup> In strict accordance with the revealed process of Redemption, it is a beautiful provision of the Catholic Church to follow the same order in the sacred ordinance which commemorates and represents it. For, at least since the time of the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397,) it was ordained, that, when the Priest stood at the altar, prayer should ever be directed to the FATHER.<sup>g</sup> And while the Incarnate WORD is by virtue of His Promise and the solemnity of Consecration really present under the sacraments of Bread and Wine, the types of His Humanity, it is by the illapse of the HOLY SPIRIT that the act of highest Love is represented and completed; the same Divine *Paraclite* or Advocate, Who assisted at the Incarnation, interceding also at each successive

<sup>d</sup> S. Basil. De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 16, Tom. II. p. 180.

<sup>e</sup> S. John iii. 16.

<sup>f</sup> Heb. ix. 14.

<sup>g</sup> Et cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio." Conc. Carth. iii. Can. 23. *ap.* Labbe, Tom. II. p. 1170.

step of its development. The Book of Common Prayer still witnesses silently to the dogma of the Subordination of the SON and SPIRIT to the FATHER. For only *three* of the collects are addressed directly to the SON, *none* to the HOLY GHOST. Had Arius refrained from *Hellenic* inventions, the formula 'Glory be to the FATHER *through* the SON *in* the HOLY GHOST' would have been unsuspected; for it does express the actual mode of our worship.

Yet whensoever the Church requires a more direct adoration of the SON and SPIRIT, (as in the Litany,) we must gladly render it. On supreme occasions the Apostles offered divine worship to the incarnate SON, (as at His ascension,) and it was accepted. S. T. Coleridge (*Table Talk*, July 8, 1827,) objects to the Athanasian Creed its omission or implied denial of the Filial Subordination in the Godhead. And, truly, it needed not the bathos of "inferior to the FATHER as touching His Manhood"! as if there could be a question as to the inferiority of the creature to the Creator. As S. Gregory Nazianzen says, "This is not saying much; for what wonder is it, if GOD be greater than man?" Rather should we not expect, 'inferior to the FATHER as touching His Sonship'? or, 'in that He is Begotten, caused, originated'?

§. 12. An error of an intermediate character may be traced as a consequence of the Nestorian heresy of separating the Godhead and Manhood of CHRIST. It is thus noticed in a Letter subscribed by Aurelius of Carthage, S. Augustine, and other African bishops, remitting a priest of the name of Leporius with his recantation to Proculus of Marseilles and other bishops of Gaul, A.D. 426. "If then," the document says, "by no means perceiving this power of GOD, being wise in our own sense and proper reason, lest GOD should seem to do what is below Himself, we should say that Man was born along with GOD, so as to assign to GOD alone separately the things which are GOD's and reckon separately to Man alone the things which are man's, we most plainly introduce a fourth Person in the TRINITY, and begin to make of the One SON of GOD not one but two CHRISTs; which may our LORD and GOD CHRIST Himself now avert from us!"<sup>b</sup>

Further  
Errors.

<sup>b</sup> Leporii Libellus, *ap.* Labbe, Tom II. p. 1679.

A third error, held by the Abbat Joachim of Calabria, was condemned in the Council of the Lateran, A.D. 1215, presided over by Pope Innocent the Third. Joachim, although he granted that the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST are one essence, one substance, and one nature, yet confessed that a Unity of this sort was not real and proper, but as it were collective and by way of similitude: even as many men are called one people, and many believers one Church; according to the passage, 'And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul;' <sup>1</sup> 'But He that is joined to the LORD is one spirit;' <sup>2</sup> 'Now He that planteth and He that watereth are one;' <sup>3</sup> 'But now are they many members, but one body.' <sup>4</sup> Again, in the first book of Kings; "I am as thou art; my people as thy people."<sup>5</sup> But chiefly in order to confirm his opinion he cited that saying of CHRIST in the Gospel concerning believers, "that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one."<sup>6</sup> For, said he, "believers in CHRIST are not one, that is, some one thing common to all; but in this manner they are one Church, because of the unity of the Catholic Faith, and the union of indissoluble charity." "But we," proceeds the Council, "believe and confess, that there is a certain one Sovereign Thing, incomprehensible indeed and ineffable, which is truly FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST; and there is only Trinity, not quaternity: because each of the Three Persons is that Thing, to wit, substance, essence, or Divine Nature; which alone is the principle of all things, beside which none other can be found; and that Thing begetteth not, nor is begotten, nor proceeds, but is the FATHER Who begetteth, and the SON Who is begotten, and the HOLY GHOST Who proceedeth; so that the distinctions are in the Persons and the unity in the Nature."<sup>7</sup>

I forbear at present to say more about the Arian heresy, which comes naturally under consideration in the question of the Consubstantiality of the SON with the FATHER: while

<sup>1</sup> Acts iv. 32.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* iii. 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* xii. 20.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Kings xxii. 4.

<sup>6</sup> S. John. xvii. 22, 23.

<sup>7</sup> Decret. Greg. Tit. I. *De Summa Trinitate*, cap. 2, *ap.* Corpus Juris Canonici.

the heresy of Sabellius is virtually a denial, not a perversion, of the doctrine of the TRINITY.

§. 13. I will only notice further the dispute, which arose in the ninth century between Hincmar archbishop of Rheims and the monk Gotteschalck about the term 'Trine Deity.' This the Archbishop wished to see expunged out of the Church hymns, to avoid the appearance of acknowledging a Triple Deity. Gotteschalck and Ratramnus opposed him at the peril of being charged with heresy.<sup>p</sup> Natalis Alexander says; "that the cause of Gotteschalck and Ratramnus was better than that of Hincmar is agreed from the judgment of the Church, which in the hymn 'Sacris Sollemniis' published by S. Thomas Aquinas sings everywhere:

Of the term  
'Trine  
Deity.'

'Te, Trina Deitas Unaque, poscimus,  
Sic nos tu visita, sicut Te colimus;  
Per Tuas semitas duc nos quo tendimus,  
Ad lucem quam inhabitas.'"<sup>a</sup>

But I applaud Hincmar. The Deity or Divine Nature is one, not trine. If trine, then divisible; which is blasphemous. God lived on earth and died in the Person of the SON, not in the entire Godhead.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Mabillon. in Præfat. ad  
Part. II. sæc. iv. Actt. SS Ord. S.  
Benedicti, §. ix. cap. 2, p. 72.

<sup>a</sup> Nat. Alex. Hist. Eccles. Tom.  
VI. p. 299.

## CHAPTER VI.

## OF THE LOGOS OR WORD OF GOD; OF HIS ETERNAL GENERATION, AND CONSUBSTANTIALITY WITH THE FATHER.

Of the Divinity of the Word.

§. 1. IT was the usual practice of the early Christian writers, in introducing the doctrines of the Faith to the consideration of the heathen philosophers, to blend the Revelation of the Second Person in the TRINITY with the received theories concerning the archetypal Reason or Intellect, which framed the visible universe and emanated directly from the mysterious and hidden First Cause of all things. It may be that they erred on the side of indiscreet zeal; that in their anxiety to smooth the way for the acceptance of Christianity by many who came as near to the Truth as unaided human reason would allow, they mixed up too much of the earthly element with the heavenly, and laid the foundation for future heresies. But it is not for us who have entered on the inheritance of the Faith without prejudices to be removed or difficulties to be overcome, whose belief too often amounts to nothing better than an indolent uninterested assent to propositions recommended by custom or authority: it is not for us lightly to blame them, or to affect the supercilious brow of an immaculate and superior criticism. Be it ours to profit by the results of their stammering efforts, and acquiesce in the decisions of the Catholic Church. It was necessary to assume some starting point in breaking up the ground, which issued in the rich harvest of the Gentiles; and the fresh turn, which the Fathers gave to the Platonic disquisitions respecting the Logos or Divine Reason, was as legitimate as S. Paul's developing the incident of the Athenian inscription 'to the Unknown God' into a declaration of Him Whom they

ignorantly worshipped. The Jewish belief in the coming MESSIAH, however alloyed with dreams of His temporal splendour, and invariably falling far short of the spiritual reality, still formed the ground on which Apostolic missionaries might build up souls in the faith. And the purest Greek philosophy was as it were a thinner and clearer atmosphere, through which the light of the Gospel might shine forth serenely.

Accordingly we find Tertullian thus availing himself of the notions current among the philosophic heathen, in these terms. "We have already declared that GOD formed this universe by His Word, and reason and power. With your own wise men, too, it is agreed, that the Logos, that is, Word and Reason, appears to be the artificer of the universe; for him Zeno determines to be the Maker, Who hath formed all things in order and calls the same 'Fate' and 'GOD' and 'the soul of Jupiter' and 'the necessity of all things.' These names Cleanthes confers on a Spirit which he will have to pervade the universe. And we too entitle Spirit as His proper essence to the WORD and Reason and Virtue, whereby we have declared that GOD formed all things; in Whom the WORD indwelleth when He foretells, and Reason is at hand when He disposes, and Virtue presides when He accomplishes. Him we have taught to have proceeded from GOD, and to have been begotten by procession, and that He is therefore called 'SON of GOD' and 'GOD' from the unity of substance. For GOD also is a Spirit; and when a ray proceeds out of the sun, a portion is put forth out of the sum total; but the sun will be in the ray, because it is the sun's ray, nor is the substance separated but extended. So is SPIRIT of SPIRIT, and GOD of GOD, as light kindled of light. The matrix of a material remains entire and fails not, although you may borrow many grafts. So too that which hath proceeded from GOD is GOD and SON of GOD, and both are One. So also SPIRIT of SPIRIT and GOD of GOD. He maketh another in modification (*modulo*), not in number; in grade, not in condition; and retires not from His matrix, but proceeds from it." <sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> Tert. Apologeticus. cap. xxi. p.  
19. Petavius thus expounds the

term 'modulus' as used above:  
"Nam modulum vocat (Tertullianus)

In like manner S. Justin Martyr in his Apology even claims credit to Christianity for gathering within its cycle of doctrine all that was excellent in the Pagan systems. "As many things," he says, "as have been well said among all belong to us Christians. For next to GOD (*μετὰ τὸν Θεόν*) we adore and love the WORD (proceeding) from the unbegotten and ineffable GOD; since He also for our sake became Man, that having become partaker in our sufferings He might likewise effect our healing."\* How dangerous and (to say the very least) unguarded this language of Justin's is may be seen by Origen's development of it in his book against Celsus. In one passage he not only calls the Logos a 'second GOD,' but seems to insinuate that this *Plotinistic* Logos dwelt in JESUS only in a more complete and perfect way than in other men; which is not even an Arian but a Socinian tenet. Thus he writes; "Even though we call Him a *second God*, let them know that by the 'second GOD' we mean nothing else than the Virtue that embraces all virtues, and the Reason that embraces all reason whatsoever of those, who according to nature have been produced pre-eminently and for the benefit of the universe. And this Reason we assert to have attached Itself to, and been united with, the soul of JESUS especially beyond any soul; Who alone was able perfectly to contain the consummate participation of the absolute Reason, Wisdom, and Justice (*τοῦ αὐτολόγου καὶ τῆς αὐτοσοφίας καὶ τῆς αὐτοδικαιοσύνης*)."† Again: "We worship then the FATHER of Truth, and the SON (Who is) Truth; being two things in substance, but one in unanimity and harmony and identity of will: so that he that hath seen the SON, being the reflexion of the glory and the impress of the substance of GOD, hath seen GOD in Him, being the image

nus,) *τρόπον τῆς ὑπόφωτος*, ut Græci loquuntur, certum modum, quo derivatus a Patre Filius existit; uti radius emissus a sole extra ipsum extenditur: ita ut idem sit status, hoc est, *οὐσία*, vel *ὑπόστασις*, ut tum loquebantur, luminis; gradus vero diversus, id est, persona. Sic in libro adversus Praxeam, 'Tres esse,' scribit, 'non statu, sed gradu;

nec substantia, sed forma, nec potestate, sed specie.' Ubi 'forma' est *Personalis Proprietas*; ut et 'species'; quæ communem naturam modificat ad seque trahit." Petavius, Dogm. Theol. De Trinitate, L. i. cap. v. §. 4.

\* S. Justin. Mart. Apolog. I. Opp. p. 51.

† Orig. Cont. Cels. Lib. iv. p. 265.

of GOD.”<sup>u</sup> Elsewhere he assigns to the LOGOS no higher functions than are attributed to the Saints in the Roman Theology. “But we,” he writes, “venerate JESUS, Who hath translated our intellect from every sensible object, such as is not only corruptible, but doomed to perish, and hath raised it to the honour, which relates to the Supreme GOD; with prayers, which we offer to Him; inasmuch as He is in truth between (*μεταξὺ ὧντος*) the nature of the Unbegotten and that of all begotten things, and brings us the benefits of the FATHER, and as High-priest conveys our prayers to the Supreme GOD.”<sup>v</sup> Here the LOGOS is spoken of only as the *mesotesis* or middle term existing between the Created and the Uncreated, the Finite and the Infinite. Prayers are offered to the FATHER through Him as our High-priest; which might pass, provided Origen had spoken also of offering prayers equally to the LOGOS in His own person.”

I cannot accept the strange language of Theophilus of Antioch. He says that the LOGOS was continually laid up in GOD's heart (*ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ*). “For before anything was made, He had Him as His Counsellor, being His mind and Wisdom. But when GOD willed to make as many things as He chose, He begat this WORD in expression (*προφορικόν*), firstborn of all creation; not emptying Himself of His WORD, but begetting the WORD and continually conversing with Him. Whence the Holy Scriptures teach us, and all the inspired writers; one of whom John saith, ‘In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with GOD;’ showing, that at first GOD was alone, and the WORD in Him. Then he says, ‘And the WORD was GOD. All things were made *through* Him (*δι’ αὐτοῦ*), and apart from Him (*χωρὶς αὐτοῦ*) was there not made a single thing.”<sup>x</sup> Bull labours

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* L. viii. p. 397.

<sup>v</sup> *Ibid.* L. iii. 135.

<sup>w</sup> He in one place distinctly asserts the SON to be inferior to the FATHER, (*οὐκ ἰσχυρότερον τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀλλ’ ὑποδεέστερον*, L. viii. p. 399.) I make these statements, as the results of the impressions left on my mind by a careful perusal of the plain texts of Justin and Origen, without suffering myself to be

warped by the conflicting representations of Petavius and Bishop Bull. I would say that many statements of the ante-Nicene Fathers lend themselves to an Arian meaning. See, for instance, the shocking deliverance of Eusebius, cited above, chap. v. §. 10, which Bishop Bull somehow does not notice.

<sup>x</sup> S. Theophilus, ad Autolyceum, Lib. ii. p. 100.



hard to acquit this sinister language as expressing only the order of the Divine Persons. (*Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, Lib. IV.) But what notion, I ask, would such expressions as 'the Word next to GOD,' 'a *second* GOD,' 'laid up in GOD's heart,' but 'expressed to create the world,' produce in a heathen mind, save that of a Pallas sprung out of the head of Zeus, that is, Wisdom born of the Power of Life? Surely the Church must sometimes improve as she grows 'in wisdom and stature': and Photius meets the case, where he says of an ancient Father, that he wrote "in the old fashion, not reaching the accuracy of later times."

I turn with satisfaction from this portentous statement to the clear words of Damascene, whereby we may learn to value the experience which the Church gains in the exposition of GOD's Word. "There never was," says he, "when GOD was without (His) Word or Reason (*ἄλογος*); but He ever hath His WORD begotten of Himself, not after the manner of our word unsubstantial and dissipated into air, but substantial, living, perfect, not departing out of Him, but being ever in Him. For where should It be, outside of Him? For as our nature is mortal and easily dissolved, therefore also our word is unsubstantial. But GOD ever being and being perfect shall have His WORD perfect, substantial, ever being, living, and omnipotent as His Begetter. For as our word, proceeding from the intellect, is neither entirely the same as the intellect nor in all respects different; since being from the intellect, it is beside it; and, as it reveals the intellect, it no longer in all respects differs from it, but being the same thing according to nature, it subjectively differs: so also the WORD of GOD, Who is the SON, in His self-subsistence, is distinguished from Him, from Whom he derives His essential generation (*παρ' οὗ τὴν γένεσιν ὑπόστασιν ἔχει*); but, in that He exhibits the same things in Himself which are seen concerning GOD, He is the same in nature with Him."<sup>7</sup> I should here notice that the ante-Nicene Fathers introduce a sort of second Nativity of the WORD, neither in time, nor yet properly in eternity, a prelude of His incarnation; by which they mean the expression or putting forth of the WORD for the purpose of creating

<sup>7</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, Lib. i. cap. 6.

the world; as if His contact with matter was a humiliation to the Divine Person. And herein they are followed by S. Athanasius and championed by Bishop Bull. Truly, this is as dark a mystery as the Circumincision. Yet it seems required by the Epistle to the Hebrews ch. i. v. 6.

§. 2. That the Generation of the WORD is eternal, never beginning and never ending, is clear from what has been already said in treating of the Divine attributes, particularly from the simplicity and eternity of the Godhead. God knoweth not Past or Future in His blissful Essence, but is an *everlasting Now*. S. Paul proclaims "JESUS CHRIST, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."\* And although we say in the Creed, 'Begotten of His FATHER before all worlds,' the expression is to be understood as directed against the Arian statement, that there was a period when the SON of GOD was not; not as introducing the mediation of time into the Divine Essence, which is blasphemous and heretical. For the same argument, which serves to exclude the ascription of Time to the Godhead, in an antecedent relation, will also be found to forbid the idea of Time as consequent upon the Generation of the WORD. For, as Damascene observes, "in speaking of Him as before all worlds, we show that His generation is without time or beginning."†

Of the Eternal Generation of the Word.

The use of the past participle in speaking of the Generation of the Second Person seems most suitable, when we regard Him under the notion of SON; because it better preserves the analogy with our own conceptions. Yet the present participle (*nascens*, not *natus*) is more agreeable with the abstract and immaterial notion of the WORD and Wisdom of GOD. S. Gregory the Great indeed says, "Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, in that He is the Virtue and Wisdom of GOD, was born of the FATHER before times; or rather, because He never began or ceased to be born, let us more truly say, 'He was ever born;' but we cannot say 'He is ever born,' lest He should seem to be imperfect."‡ But the Council of Lateran decides

\* Heb. xiii. 8.

† L. i. cap. 8.

‡ S. Greg. Magn. Moral. in Job, Lib. xxix. cap. 1. Peter Lombard

also prefers the saying 'semper natus' (Sent. Lib. i. Dist. ix.); wherein he is followed by Aquinas, (Summa, i. qu. 42, art. 2)

contrariwise : saying, “ without beginning, ever and without end, the FATHER begetting, the Son being born (*nascens*), and the HOLY GHOST proceeding.”<sup>e</sup> And this hath been the most received expression. Thus Origen, who has the credit of inventing the term ‘ eternal Generation : ’ “ Our SAVIOUR is the brightness of glory ; but brightness is not once for all born, and then ceases to be born ; for as often as light springs up, so also springs up the brightness of glory. Our SAVIOUR is the Wisdom of GOD. But Wisdom is the brightness of Eternal Light. Thus then the SAVIOUR is ever being born, and therefore He saith ; ‘ Before all the hills He begetteth Me,’ not as some read badly, ‘ begot Me.’<sup>d</sup>

Furthermore, however Ruffinus may have made Origen’s books *Peri Archon* harmonise with orthodoxy, I scruple not to borrow from the work, as it now stands, where it appears to me to elucidate Christian truth. And it doth seem to do so eminently in the present case. Having premised a protest against comparing this sacred Mystery too closely with earthly examples or aught that the human mind can compass, the author proceeds thus : “ For the Generation is eternal and everlasting, like as brightness is begotten of light. For He doth not become SON externally through the adoption of the SPIRIT, but is by nature SON. Let us see however, how what we say is also fortified by the authority of Divine Scripture. The Apostle saith that the Only-begotten SON is the image of the invisible GOD and the first-born of the whole creation ; writing to the Hebrews he saith of Him, that He is the brightness of glory and the express figure of His substance.<sup>e</sup> We find moreover in the Wisdom of Solomon a certain description of the Wisdom of GOD written in this wise : ‘ For she is the breath of the power of GOD, and a most pure effluence of the glory of the ALMIGHTY.’<sup>f</sup> ‘ Therefore can no defiled thing fall into her. For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of GOD, and the image of His goodness.’ But we call Wisdom that which derives its subsistency from Him Who is

<sup>e</sup> Decret. Greg. Lib. i. c. 1. *ap.*  
Corpus Juris Canonici.

<sup>d</sup> Prov. viii. 25. Origen. In Hie-

*e* miam, Hom. vi. p. 373.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. i. 3.

<sup>f</sup> Wisd. vii. 25, 26.

the beginning of all, whereof too was born whatever wisdom ; because He Himself is alone by nature SON, therefore also He is called Only-Begotten.”<sup>a</sup> S. Augustine also confirms this view, in his comment on the Psalm, ‘The LORD said unto Me, Thou art My SON, this day have I begotten Thee.’ “ Although the day, whereon JESUS CHRIST was born according to men, may also seem to be spoken of in the prophecy : yet ‘this day,’ because it signifies presence, and in eternity there is neither past, nor future, but only present, because whatever is eternal is ever ; (‘this day’) is taken according to the saying, ‘This day have I begotten Thee,’ whereby the Catholic Faith proclaims the eternal generation of the Virtue and Wisdom of God, Who is the Only-Begotten SON.”<sup>b</sup> He elsewhere employs the image of a plant growing by the water-side, whose form is simultaneously reflected in the clear stream, to illustrate the co-eternal existence of the Begotten SON, and the Unbegotten FATHER, Whose express image He is.<sup>1</sup> But however apposite these illustrations may have seemed to Augustine and others, (and I presume they were as fair as those employed by the Neo-Platonists ;) they will be felt inadequate, when we observe how the unsubstantial reflection in the stream of a substantial form outside suggests the Arian or *Homoi-ousian* theory rather than the Catholic.

§. 3. The Person of the Word is co-essential or consubstantial with the FATHER by reason of His eternal Generation. The Church sings in the Nicene Creed, ‘Being of one substance with the FATHER’ (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί*) ; by which term she affirms that the SON is not of a different nature from the FATHER, as are ‘all things visible and invisible’ whereof He is the ‘Maker ;’ but of one and the same nature, essence, and substance, even as a human son partakes of his father’s nature. Nor yet of a merely similar nature and essence (*ὁμοίους*), as one man resembles another without identity ; but of one and the same essence, without separation, commixture, or confusion.<sup>1</sup>

Of his Con-  
substan-  
tiality with  
the FATHER.

<sup>a</sup> Origen. *Peri Archon*, Lib. i. c. 2, p. 424.

<sup>b</sup> S. Aug. *Enarratio in Ps. ii. 6.* Tom. IV. p. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Sermo cxvii. De Verbis Domini, cap. ix. Tom. V. p. 586.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Co-essential’ would be a purer translation of the celebrated word

The reason why this term *ὁμοούσιος* was adopted by the Nicene Fathers may be best explained in the words of S. Athanasius, who was present at the Council: "The bishops again asking those who seemed but few," (the Eusebian or Arian faction), "whether they said that the SON was, not a creature, but the Power, Sole Wisdom of the FATHER, and Eternal Image, in all respects undeviating from the FATHER, and Very GOD, the Eusebians were caught whispering to one another, "These terms even reach to us also, for we too are both called the glory of God; <sup>k</sup> and concerning us it is written, 'For we which live'; <sup>l</sup> and the palmer-worm and the locusts are called 'a great army'; <sup>m</sup> and 'The Lord of hosts is with us, the GOD of Jacob is our refuge'; <sup>n</sup> for not only are we GOD's own, but He hath also called us brethren. And if they call the SON even Very GOD, it doth not trouble us; for He *is become* Very (GOD)." This was the perverse thought of the Arians. But here also the bishops perceiving their wiliness brought together out of the Scriptures (*the illustrations of*) the Reflexion of light, the Well and the River, and the Impression with reference to the Substance, and the passage 'In Thy light shall we see light,' <sup>o</sup> and 'I and the FATHER are one; <sup>p</sup> and they wrote more lucidly (*λευκότερον*) thenceforth and compendiously, that the SON is consubstantial with the FATHER; for all the aforesaid expressions have this signification. And their murmuring that the words were unscriptural is convicted of vanity by themselves. Having broached impiety from unscriptural sources, (for the expressions 'From that which is not' (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*), and 'There was once when He was not' are unscriptural), they find fault that they were condemned by unscriptural words as piety understands them: they themselves indeed spoke truly

*ὁμοούσιος* than 'Consubstantial; ' though, as Augustine says, *essence* and *substance* are but new terms, invented to denote modified conceptions of nature. Thus: "Nam et ipsa natura nihil est aliud, quam id quod intelligitur in suo genere aliquid esse. Itaque ut nos jam novo nomine ab eo, quod est esse, vocamus essentiam, quam plerumque substantiam etiam nominamus:

ita veteres, qui hæc nomina non habebant, pro essentia et substantia naturam vocabant." S. Aug. De Moribus Manichæorum, Lib. ii. cap. 2, Tom. I. p. 716.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 7.

<sup>l</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 11.

<sup>m</sup> Joel ii. 25.

<sup>n</sup> Ps. xlv. 7.

<sup>o</sup> Ps. xxxvi. 9.

<sup>p</sup> St. John x. 30.

in an earthly strain (*ἀπὸ γῆς*); but the bishops, not inventing the words for themselves but having their proof from the Fathers, wrote so. For ancient bishops, (near about a hundred and thirty years ago), of great Rome and of our city, in writing blamed those that called the SON a creature and not consubstantial with the FATHER. And this knew Eusebius late bishop of Cæsarea, who at first concurred with the Arian heresy; but afterwards, having subscribed in the Nicene Synod itself, he wrote to his partizans, affirming, "We know that certain erudite and eminent bishops and writers even of the ancients used the term 'Consubstantial' in the case of the Divinity of the FATHER and the SON."<sup>a</sup>

In like manner the Council of Paris (A.D. 362), holden in order to condemn the proceeding at Ariminum, writing to the Eastern Bishops, saith; "For we have embraced the word "Consubstantial" (*Homousiou sermonem*) to express the very and legitimate nativity of the Only-Begotten of GOD the FATHER; detesting the downright union according to the blasphemies of Sabellius, nor (yet) understanding the SON to be any part of the FATHER but to be born whole and perfect Only-Begotten GOD of whole and perfect Unbegotten GOD; therefore confessed by us of one essence (*usice*) or substance with GOD the FATHER, lest rather He should seem to be a creature or an adoption or an appellation. And because He is of Him, as a son from a father, as GOD of GOD, as Strength of Strength, as Spirit of Spirit, as Light of Light. Not unwillingly also hearing that he is like to GOD the FATHER; inasmuch as He is the image of the invisible GOD. But understanding that likeness to the FATHER to be worthy, which is of Very GOD to Very GOD. Chiefly, when our LORD

<sup>a</sup> S. Athan. Ep. ad Episcopos in Africa, Opp. Tom. I. pp. 936, 7. The elder use of the term *Homousios* may be corroborated by two passages in Origen's Dialogue against the Marcionites; "πιστεύοντες καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ Θεὸν Λόγον, ὁμοούσιον, ἀεὶ ὄντα." §. 1, p. 3. And "Ὁμοούσιος γὰρ καὶ ἀχώριστος ἡ μακαρία Τριὰς." §. 5, p. 159. And, if we may trust Rufinus's translation, it would seem that Origen wrote on the Epistle to

the Hebrews to the same effect. Referring to the similitudes in the Wisdom of Solomon, he says; "Quæ utraque similitudines manifestissime ostendunt communionem substantiæ esse Filio cum Patre. Aporrhœa enim ὁμοούσιος videtur, id est, unius substantiæ cum illo corpore ex quo est vel aporrhœa vel vapor." (Vid. Pamphili pro Origene Apologiam, ap. Origen. Opp. p. 486.)

JESUS CHRIST Himself hath professed to His Disciples, saying, 'I and the FATHER are one.'<sup>r</sup> Whereby He signifies not only His love to the FATHER but also the Divinity which is GOD's of GOD (*quæ Dei ex Deo est*); according to that, 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the FATHER';<sup>s</sup> and, 'Though ye believe not Me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the FATHER is in Me, and I in Him.'"<sup>t</sup>

I will add Origen's exposition of the metaphor 'Image of GOD,' as applied to the LOGOS; inasmuch as it is important in an account of the *Homoousios*. "Sometimes," he says, "that is called an image, which is wont to be painted or carved in some material, that is, of wood or stone. Sometimes he that is born is called the image of him who begat him, when the lineaments of the child in no respect belie the resemblance of his sire. I think then that he who after the image and likeness of GOD was created man may fit the former example. But to the second may be compared the image of the SON of GOD, of which we are now treating; and according to this, that He is the invisible Image of the invisible GOD, as historically we call Seth Adam's son his likeness; so also is it written, 'And Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.'<sup>u</sup> Which Image also contains the unity of the nature and substance of the FATHER and of the SON. For if all that the FATHER doth, the SON doth likewise, namely, doth all things even as the FATHER; the image of the FATHER is formed in the SON, Who, to wit, is born of Him as a will proceeding from His mind. And therefore I think that the FATHER's will ought to suffice in order that that should subsist which (He) the FATHER willeth. So then the subsistency also of the SON is begotten by Him. Which must be received in the first place by those who acknowledge nothing unbegotten save GOD the FATHER only. For it is to be observed, lest any one run into the absurd fables of those who picture to themselves certain emanations (*prolationes*), so that they apportion the Divine Nature and (as far as lies in them) divide GOD the FATHER;

<sup>r</sup> S. John x. 30.

<sup>s</sup> *Ib.* xiv. 9.

<sup>t</sup> *Ib.* x. 38. Conc. Paris. Synodica, ap. Labbe, Tom. II. p. 821.

<sup>u</sup> Gen. v. 3.

when even to lightly suspect this of the incorporeal Nature is not only a matter of extreme impiety but even of the last folly; nor is it altogether consequent to intelligence to suppose a substantial division of an incorporeal nature. More then according as the will proceeds from the mind, and neither sunders any part of it nor is divided from it, in some such manner may we imagine the FATHER to have begotten the SON, to wit, His own image; that, as He Himself is invisible by nature, so also He may have begotten an invisible image. For the SON is the WORD; and therefore nothing sensuous is to be understood in Him. He is Wisdom, and nothing corporeal is to be suspected in Wisdom. He is 'the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;' but hath nothing in common with the light of this sun (of ours). Our SAVIOUR then is the invisible image of GOD the FATHER, as far as the Truth is related to the FATHER Himself; but, as far as it relates to us to whom He reveals the FATHER, He is the image whereby we know the FATHER, Whom none other knoweth save the SON, and he to whom the SON will reveal Him. But He reveals Him hereby, in that He Himself is understood. For by whom Himself shall have been understood, by him consequently the FATHER is understood also; according as Himself hath said, 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the FATHER.'<sup>v</sup>

§. 4. It will not be inexpedient to pause here, and refresh our souls with the most pure waters of GOD's written Word; which in some degree justifies its analogy to Him the Very and Eternal WORD, Whose coming down was "like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth."<sup>x</sup> There GOD converses with us, and enriches our spiritual nature beyond the measure of the bare intellect. Gainsayers and heretics compel the Church to exchange the language of the altar and the closet for that of the schools: but the intermixture of secular terms is rather forced on her than willingly sought for; the words of the Bridegroom are dearest to the Bride; nor can she (to adapt the poet's expression)—

Scripture  
proof of the  
Divinity of  
the WORD  
and of his  
co-equality  
with the  
FATHER.

<sup>v</sup> S. John i. 9.

<sup>x</sup> Ps. lxxii. 6.

<sup>v</sup> Origen. Peri Archon, Lib. i.  
cap. 2, p. 424.



“Forget the glories she hath known,  
And that Imperial Palace whence she came.”<sup>7</sup>

These then are the principal texts, which the Catholic Church believes exhibit the Divinity of the SON and his Consubstantiality with the Father. *α*. “Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever : the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness : therefore GOD, Thy GOD, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.”<sup>8</sup> The Apostle applies this to the SON. <sup>8</sup>

*β*. “Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call His name Immanuel;”<sup>9</sup> which S. Matthew interprets “GOD with us.”<sup>9</sup> *γ*. “For unto us a Child is born, unto us a SON is given : and the government shall be upon His shoulder : and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty GOD, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”<sup>4</sup> But *El Schaddai*, The Mighty GOD, is one of the incommunicable names of the ALMIGHTY ; and its attribution to the Child thus foretold denotes His being Very GOD of Very GOD. *δ*. “Behold, your GOD will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.”<sup>5</sup> The latter clause being fulfilled in JESUS shows that the former is to be understood of Him ; and He Himself alludes to the passage in His reply to John the Baptist.<sup>6</sup> *ε*. “Thus saith the LORD, The labour of Egypt, and merchandise of Ethiopia, and of the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine : they shall come after thee ; in chains they shall come over, and they shall fall down unto thee, they shall make supplication unto thee, saying, Surely, GOD is in thee ; and there is none else, there is no GOD. Verily Thou art a GOD that hidest Thyself, O GOD of Israel, the SAVIOUR.”<sup>7</sup> This can only be understood of the SON, for it is JEHOVAH Who speaks ; nor can the words “Surely GOD is in thee” be in any sense applied to the FATHER by believers in

<sup>7</sup> Wordsworth, Ode, ‘Intimations of Immortality.’

<sup>8</sup> Ps. xlv. 6, 7.

<sup>9</sup> Heb. i. 8.

<sup>9</sup> Isaiah vii. 14.

<sup>8</sup> S. Matt. i. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. ix. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Isa. xxxv. 4, 5

<sup>6</sup> S. Matt. xi. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. xlv. 14, 15.

the TRINITY, nor be expounded satisfactorily by those who deny It. ζ. In the same chapter it is written ; " I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of My mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto Me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."<sup>h</sup> But S. Paul expressly applies this text to CHRIST; " For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of CHRIST. For it is written, As I live, saith the LORD, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to GOD. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to GOD."<sup>i</sup> Now that this which S. Paul applies to CHRIST is spoken by Isaiah in the person of JEHOVAH is most certain, because no one in Scripture sweareth by himself except GOD, for there is none greater to swear by than Himself: " For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein GOD, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath."<sup>j</sup> η. " For thus saith the LORD of Hosts; After the glory hath He sent Me unto the nations which spoiled you: for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of His eye."<sup>k</sup> Here the LORD of Hosts clearly sends and is sent. Here the LORD of Hosts declares in His Own Person that He is sent unto the nations; but by whom? By the LORD of Hosts. And for what purpose? That those nations should be joined to the LORD, and thereby become the people of the Person Who speaks and Who declares of Himself already that He is sent. " For, behold," He continues, " I will shake Mine hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their servants: and ye shall know that the LORD of Hosts hath sent Me. Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the LORD. And many nations shall be joined unto the LORD in that day, and shall be My people, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the LORD of Hosts hath sent Me unto thee."<sup>l</sup> θ. Again in the vision of Joshua the high priest standing before the Angel of the LORD, it is said; " And the LORD said

<sup>h</sup> Isa. xlv. 23.<sup>k</sup> Zech. ii. 8.<sup>i</sup> Rom. xiv. 10—12.<sup>l</sup> *Ib.* 9—11.<sup>j</sup> Heb. vi. 16, 17.

unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan ; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee." <sup>m</sup> Here the incommunicable Name JEHOVAH is used twice ; first, to denote the Person Who speaks ; secondly, to designate Him Whose rebuke the speaker denounces. *ι.* Again the LORD saith, " And I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications : and they shall look upon Me Whom they have pierced." <sup>n</sup> But S. John applies this passage to the piercing the Sacred side of JESUS on the Cross, which in Zechariah He speaketh of Himself, Who " stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." <sup>ο</sup> What are we to infer thence but the identity of the Man JESUS with JEHOVAH Himself in One of His Persons, the WORD made flesh, Who dwelt among us and thereby is become Emmanuel, GOD with us ?

To come to the New Testament : *κ.* The Angel foretold of S. John Baptist ; " And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the LORD their GOD. And he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias." <sup>p</sup> But no Christian ever understood the Baptist to be the precursor of the FATHER, but of JESUS ; Who is therefore hereby proved to be the LORD GOD of Israel. *λ.* When MESSIAH declared Himself to be the SON of GOD, calling GOD His FATHER, the Jews straightway understood His so doing as tantamount to an assertion of His co-equality with GOD : " Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that GOD was His FATHER, making Himself equal with GOD." <sup>q</sup> *μ.* Again : " And He said unto them ; Ye are from beneath ; I am from above : ye are of this world ; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins : for if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins." <sup>r</sup> This is evidently connected with what occurs later in the same chapter ; " JESUS said unto them,

<sup>m</sup> Zech. iii. 2.

<sup>n</sup> *Ib.* xii. 10.

<sup>ο</sup> *Ib.* xii. 1. S. John xix. 37.

<sup>p</sup> S. Luke i. 16, 17.

<sup>q</sup> S. John v. 18.

<sup>r</sup> S. John viii. 23, 24. The

Greek of the last clause is, *ὅτι γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν.* There is nothing to require the supplying of 'he,' as in the Authorised Version we read 'that I am *he*.'

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am."\* The Jews must have understood Him to allude to GOD's bidding Moses say, "I AM hath sent me unto you."† For it immediately follows, "Then took they up stones to cast at Him,"‡ as in a case of blasphemy. ν. This is made yet more evident by the fact of their on another occasion understanding His assertion of His unity with His FATHER as equivalent to a declaration of His co-equal Divinity. They did not once suppose that His saying "I and My FATHER are one"§ could be referred to so barren a purport as a declaration of the unity which exists between an ambassador and the sovereign whom he represents, between a nation and the political chief who is the outward symbol of its unity, between a prophet and the Divine SPIRIT Who controls his utterance; but they *did* at once understand Him to assert thereby His own proper Godhead. "I and the FATHER are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone Him. JESUS answered them, Many good works have I showed you from My FATHER; for which of those works do ye stone Me? The Jews answered Him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself GOD."¶ ξ. Again; CHRIST saith, "Ye believe in GOD, believe also in me;" a saying which resents blasphemy, unless, as in truth He did, He meant to imply thereby His perfect equality with the FATHER.ζ ο. He declares in the fullest terms His intercommunion with the FATHER in all things; "All things that the FATHER hath are mine,"⁷ and "All Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine;"⁸ and the glory which He was going to resume is expressed as inseparable from the glory of the FATHER: "And now, O FATHER, glorify Thou Me with Thine Own Self (*παρὰ σεαυτῷ*), with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."⁹ π. When S. Thomas was convinced, and was no longer "faithless but believing," he "answered and said unto Him, My LORD and my GOD."ᵇ

\* S. John viii. 58.

† Ex. iii. 14.

‡ S. John viii. 59.

⁴ *Ib.* x. 30. Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἑσμέν.

⁵ *Ib.* vv. 30—33.

⁶ *Ib.* xiv. 1.

⁷ *Ib.* xvi. 15.

⁸ *Ib.* xvii. 10.

⁹ *Ib.* xvii. 5.

ᵇ *Ib.* xx. 28.

And when we reflect that the SPIRIT had not been given to Thomas to "guide (him) into all truth,"<sup>c</sup> such a confession from a Jew must have been the expression of his belief that JESUS and JEHOVAH were the same. ρ. Again; S. John, in accounting for the incredulity of the Jews, "though He (JESUS) had done so many miracles before them,"<sup>d</sup> cites Isaiah's prophecy; "These things said Esaias, when he saw His glory, and spake of Him."<sup>e</sup> But when we refer to Isaiah, we find that He Whom he saw was none other than the LORD of Hosts, Almighty GOD. "Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of HOSTS."<sup>f</sup> σ. S. Paul bids the Episcopal College of Ephesus to "feed the Church of GOD," which He hath purchased with His own blood."<sup>g</sup> τ. He writes of the Hebrews; "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh CHRIST came, Who is over all, GOD blessed for ever. Amen."<sup>h</sup> υ. Again; "Neither let us tempt CHRIST, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents;"<sup>i</sup> but the Person Whom they tempted was GOD, as we learn from the texts, "And they tempted GOD in their heart by asking meat for their lust,"<sup>j</sup> and "Ye shall not tempt the LORD your GOD, as ye tempted Him in Massah."<sup>k</sup> φ. Again: "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of CHRIST. Wherefore He saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."<sup>l</sup> But the Psalm which S. Paul quotes hath it thus; "The chariots of GOD are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the LORD is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, Thou hast led captivity captive: Thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the

<sup>c</sup> S. John xvi. 13.

<sup>d</sup> *Ib.* xii. 37.

<sup>e</sup> *Ib.* xii. 41.

<sup>f</sup> Isaiah vi. 5.

<sup>g</sup> Acts xx. 28. ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἱματος. Dr. Burton remarks here, "Many MSS. read κυρίου for Θεοῦ. The Vatican MS. however has Θεοῦ, and the Church

of God occurs eleven times in the New Testament, but the Church of the Lord not once." (Burton *in loc.*)

<sup>h</sup> Rom. ix. 5.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. x. 9.

<sup>j</sup> Ps. lxxviii. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Deut. vi. 16.

<sup>l</sup> Eph. iv. 7, 8.

LORD GOD might dwell among them.”<sup>m</sup> *χ*. Again: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in CHRIST JESUS: Who, being in the form of GOD, thought it not robbery to be equal with GOD.”<sup>n</sup> That is, CHRIST, being already before His Incarnation in the form or nature of GOD, proved that He was really and essentially GOD by the fact, that He did not regard His own co-equality with the FATHER (τὸ εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ) in the light of a prize which a mere man would eagerly seize and be unwilling to relinquish (οὐχ ἀπαργμὸν ᾔγγισατο); but that which He had by reason of His very Being He freely obscured for a season, by emptying Himself (ἀλλ’ αὐτὸν ἐκένωσε) so far as to give room to His being made flesh. *ψ*. S. John saith; “And we know that the SON of GOD is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His SON JESUS CHRIST. This is the true GOD, and eternal life.”<sup>o</sup> *ω*. Again; he seeth a vision of “one like unto the Son of Man,” who said unto him, “Fear not; I am the First and the Last.”<sup>p</sup> But this title is explained in a former verse, thus; “I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the LORD, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the ALMIGHTY.”<sup>q</sup> *aa*. Lastly, he saith of such as have part in the first resurrection, “They shall be priests of GOD and of CHRIST”; an expression which clearly associates CHRIST with GOD in the highest honour which we can render to Him, namely, the offering of sacrifice; whereas those who think it innocent or right to invoke the Saints for their intercessions would deem it blasphemy to offer sacrifice even to Peter or Paul, the chiefest of the Apostles.<sup>r</sup>

§. 5. I cannot quit this subject without briefly noticing the shades of heretical opinion in opposition to the truth. Those are anathematized by the Nicene Council, who say of the SON of GOD that “there was a period when He was not, and that before He was begotten He was not, and that He

Errors to be avoided.

<sup>m</sup> Ps. lxxviii. 17, 18.

<sup>n</sup> Phil. ii. 5, 6.

<sup>o</sup> 1 S. John. v. 20.

<sup>p</sup> Rev. i. 17.

<sup>q</sup> *Ib.* i. 8.

<sup>r</sup> See S. Aug. De Civitate Dei Lib. xxii. cap. 10.

was brought into being out of what had no being, or that He is of another substance or essence, or that He is created or admits of change or variableness.”\*

The first declension from orthodoxy was that of the *Homœusian* or Semi-Arian party, who were scarcely distinguishable from the Catholics, except in their rejection of the term *Homoiousios* and substitution of *Homœusios*, ‘of like substance with the FATHER.’ The Council of Antioch (A.D. 331), belonged to this party; but it afterwards broke out into grave heresy, in the person of one of its members, Macedonius of Constantinople, and denied the Personal Godhead of the HOLY GHOST. The next is that of the *Homœan* or pure Arian party, who asserted that the SON was *like* unto the FATHER in all respects except that of being Unbegotten (*ὁμοιον κατὰ πάντα πλὴν ἀγεννησίας*); or sometimes they preferred saying, “Like in all things according to the Scriptures,” (*ὁμοιον κατὰ πάντα κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς*), hoping to evade a close examination into their meaning by means of that convenient and plausible subterfuge.

The third is that of the *Anomœan* or Eunomian party, who asserted the SON of GOD to be *unlike* (*ἀνόμοιον τῷ Πατρὶ*) the FATHER; which daring impiety was reserved as an exhibition of the length to which the subtle heresy of Arius would proceed in its legitimate development. Among the numerous Creeds which the Arian controversy gave birth to, the history of the three Creeds of Sirmium may be studied with advantage; for it will be seen, how, under pretext of avoiding the term *Homoiousios* as implying an expansion of the Divine Essence (*πλατυσμός τῆς οὐσίας*) or of proscribing the terms *οὐσία*, *ὁμοούσιος*, and *ὁμοίουσιος* as being unscriptural and transcending the human intellect, they covertly laboured to leave the ground open to their own false dogmatism.<sup>†</sup> Nor is it strange that amidst their ever-varying statements, the heresy of Photinus should arise to entirely nullify the Divinity of the SON of GOD and the mystery of His Incarnation, by asserting the bare humanity of the Son of Joseph and Mary.

§. 6. The principal objections brought forward against

\* Symbolum Nicæn. ap. Labbe.  
Tom. II. p. 28.

† Labbe, Tom. II. p. 786.

the Divinity of the WORD turn on the following passages of Scripture.

Objections  
against the  
Divinity of  
the WORD.

First; "The LORD possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old,"<sup>a</sup> or, according to the Septuagint, 'The LORD created me a beginning of His ways in order to His works.' (Ὁ Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ.) As the early Fathers uniformly interpret the Wisdom spoken of by Solomon of the Eternal Wisdom Which is the WORD of GOD, this passage may either be understood figuratively of Wisdom as an abstraction and an attribute of Divinity; or as intended to emphasize the existence of the motive energy that gave birth to the *Kosmos noëros* or intellectual World, (as the Platonists say,)—"the heavenly things" spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which are the ideas of the Divine Mind, existing antecedently to their expression in and by the visible Universe; or, granting it to belong to the Personal Wisdom, it may refer to that interchange of attributes belonging to His two Natures, which arises from their hypostatic union, and which may well be anticipated here, even as elsewhere He is called "the LAMB slain from the foundation of the world."<sup>v</sup>

2. "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to GOD, even the FATHER; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet."<sup>w</sup> But the apparent limitation of His reign, indicated by the expression 'till He hath put,' (ἄχρις οὗ ἀνθῆ,) is not to be mistaken for a declaration that His reign will then terminate; for the Angel said expressly to His Virgin-Mother, "And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end."<sup>x</sup> Nor do we understand His Presence to be withdrawn from His Saints and Apostles after the end of the world, when He saith, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;"<sup>y</sup> since S. Paul saith, "And so shall we ever be with the Lord,"<sup>z</sup> after the consummation of all things. But we are to understand the perfection

<sup>a</sup> Prov. viii. 22.

<sup>v</sup> Rev. xiii. 8.

<sup>w</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25.

<sup>x</sup> S. Luke i. 33.

<sup>y</sup> S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 17.



of the work of Mediation, when Man for whose sake the WORD became flesh shall have become reconciled to the FATHER; and the perpetual Atoning Sacrifice cease to be pleaded and represented in heaven and on earth, because its object, namely, the salvation and glorification of the elect shall have been accomplished; when "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our LORD and of His CHRIST; and He shall reign for ever and ever."<sup>a</sup> With a view also to the same dispensation of His Incarnation, it is written, "And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the SON also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that GOD may be all in all."<sup>b</sup> For "He is the Head of the Body, the Church: Who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence."<sup>c</sup> "For as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: CHRIST the first-fruits; afterwards they that are CHRIST's at His coming."<sup>d</sup> But meanwhile the Church grows up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even CHRIST; "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the SON of GOD, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of CHRIST."<sup>e</sup> And as "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones;"<sup>f</sup> and as "in Him we also are builded together for an habitation of GOD through the SPIRIT,"<sup>g</sup> the SON, in His character of the first-fruits of redeemed humanity, and as summing up and representing it in His own Person, is said to become subject unto the FATHER, when His Church is ready for the full revelation of GOD. "For now we see through a glass, in a riddle; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known;"<sup>h</sup> when "the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready;"<sup>i</sup> even "the bride, the Lamb's wife," "the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from GOD out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."<sup>j</sup> Such is the subjection of the SON, even the fulfil-

<sup>a</sup> Rev. xi. 15.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 28.

<sup>c</sup> Col. i. 18.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23.

<sup>e</sup> Eph. iv. 13.

<sup>f</sup> *Ib.* iv. 30.

<sup>g</sup> *Ib.* ii. 22.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

<sup>i</sup> Rev. xix. 7.

<sup>j</sup> *Ib.* xxi. 9, 2.

ment of His FATHER's Will; as He said, "I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."<sup>k</sup> For this cause, that "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows,"<sup>l</sup> and bore so close a relation to us that "His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree,"<sup>m</sup> it is written, that He cried on the cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"<sup>n</sup> whereas He saith Himself, "Therefore doth My FATHER love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."<sup>o</sup> And again; "Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard by reason of His piety (*ἄπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*), though He were a SON, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered;"<sup>p</sup> but the reason thereof was, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."<sup>q</sup>

3. "If ye loved Me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the FATHER: for My FATHER is greater than I."<sup>r</sup> This passage may be referred to the Human Nature of CHRIST; but as it would be almost a gratuitous and unnecessary statement in that restricted sense, it may be safely understood of the superiority of the FATHER to His WORD, inasmuch as He is FATHER, and therefore Fountain and Source of the Divine Essence: especially as (so far as the persons whom He addressed were concerned) the WORD, being veiled by the flesh in a state of humiliation, had not in the flesh assumed that glory "which He had with the FATHER before the world was," and which He had even at that hour also outside of His humanity in His uncircumscribed and immutable Divinity.

<sup>k</sup> S. John xvii. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Isaiah liii. 4.

<sup>m</sup> 1 S. Pet. ii. 24.

<sup>n</sup> S. Matt. xxvii. 46.

<sup>o</sup> S. John x. 17, 18.

<sup>p</sup> Heb. v. 7, 8.

<sup>q</sup> *Ib.* ii. 14, 15.

<sup>r</sup> S. John xiv. 28.

4. "I ascend unto My FATHER, and your FATHER; and to My GOD, and your GOD."<sup>a</sup> But the words were uttered with the gracious purpose of marking more strongly than ever His union with those, whose nature He had assumed, even when before His Passion "they all forsook Him and fled;"<sup>t</sup> for He prefaced the above words by saying, "Go to My brethren." And why? Because "Whom the FATHER did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the Image of His SON, that He might be the first-born among many brethren."<sup>u</sup>

5. "For as the FATHER hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the SON to have life in Himself; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the SON of Man."<sup>v</sup> "I have manifested Thy Name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world: Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me; and they have kept Thy word."<sup>w</sup> Here we have blended together the hypostatic property of the First Person, that He begetteth the SON and therefore giveth to Him to have life in Himself, and the relations which spring from the SON'S Incarnation; "for to this end CHRIST both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be LORD both of the dead and living."<sup>x</sup>

6. "I can of Mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and My judgment is just; because I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the FATHER Which hath sent Me."<sup>y</sup> "The SON can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the FATHER do: for what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the SON likewise."<sup>z</sup> But this, so far from minishing the glory of the SON, simply declares the intimate union of the FATHER and the SON; for the co-equal Godhead of the SON is secured by what follows presently; "For the FATHER judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the SON: that all men should honour the SON, even as they honour the FATHER."<sup>a</sup>

7. "I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will,

<sup>a</sup> S. John xx. 17.

<sup>t</sup> S. Mark xiv. 50.

<sup>u</sup> Rom. viii. 29.

<sup>v</sup> S. John vi. 26, 27.

<sup>w</sup> *Ib.* xvii. 6.

<sup>x</sup> Rom. xiv. 9.

<sup>y</sup> S. John v. 30.

<sup>z</sup> *Ib.* v. 19.

<sup>a</sup> *Ib.* v. 22. καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν Πατέρα.

but the will of Him that sent Me.”<sup>b</sup> But this does not imply a real contrast between the will of CHRIST and that of His FATHER, or the possibility of an option between obedience and disobedience; for the will of the SON is positively identical with the will of His FATHER by reason of the unity of the Divine Nature. It is simply a strong negation of a notion, impossible in the present instance though not so elsewhere. For what is the FATHER’S will? “This is the FATHER’S will which hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.”<sup>c</sup>

8. “And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true GOD, and JESUS CHRIST, Whom Thou hast sent.”<sup>d</sup> And again; “And, behold, one came and said unto Him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And He said unto him, Why callest thou Me good? there is none good but one, that is, GOD.”<sup>e</sup> If it be hence pretended that the FATHER Alone answers to ‘the only true GOD,’ in such a sense as to exclude JESUS CHRIST from that nomenclature, it will be hard indeed to account for the perfect equality, whereby to know CHRIST as well as the FATHER is made the condition of life eternal. But He thus spake, because the TRINITY was not yet fully revealed, because He would guard against any gross notion of Polytheism, and because he silently taught the disciples thereby to recognise Him as that True Image of the Invisible FATHER, in Whose Divine lineaments there could be no discrepancy from the archetype. For all things are in common to them: “All things are delivered to Me of My FATHER: and no man knoweth who the SON is, but the FATHER; and who the FATHER is, but the SON, and he to whom the SON will reveal Him.”<sup>f</sup>

9. “Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto GOD by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.”<sup>g</sup> But this, so far from derogating from the co-equal Divinity of the SON, is said of His

<sup>b</sup> *Ib.* vi. 38.

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* vi. 39.

<sup>d</sup> *Ib.* xvii. 3.

<sup>e</sup> S. Matt. xix. 16, 17.

<sup>f</sup> S. Luke x. 22.

<sup>g</sup> Heb. vii. 25.

humanity, which He hath assumed into glory, as a pledge of the future glorification of His mystical Body, the Church. For we observe an exchange of pledges between the Church and her absent Spouse. He hath taken our flesh into heaven, as a pledge of our future resurrection to share His glory. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of GOD's elect? GOD that justifieth? Who is he that condemneth? CHRIST that died, yea rather, that is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of GOD, Who also maketh intercession for us?)"<sup>h</sup> For "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."<sup>i</sup> On the other hand the Church hath received the "holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our promised inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession."<sup>j</sup> Nor doth the intercession of our High Priest serve as a disproof of His Divinity any more than that of the SPIRIT; "because He" also "maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of GOD."<sup>k</sup>

Lastly, it is objected; "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the SON, but the FATHER."<sup>l</sup> For the due explication of which, see below, Chapter XIV. §. 7. It is the tendency of the Latin Church to avoid the mysterious topic of the Subordination of the SON and SPIRIT to the FATHER, from a practical fear of Arianism. The ethereal delicacy of Greek theology is soon clouded over in the West. So the *Quicunque vult*, a Western symbol, reduces the subordination of the SON to a mere "inferior . . . as touching His Manhood."

<sup>h</sup> Rom. viii. 33, 34.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 49.

<sup>j</sup> Eph. i. 13, 14.

<sup>k</sup> Rom. viii. 27.

<sup>l</sup> S. Mark xiii. 32.

## CHAPTER VII.

OF THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST, AND OF HIS  
PROCESSION.

§. 1. As the LOGOS or WORD of GOD was revealed with increasing light when the time of His Incarnation drew nigh; so the Personal Subsistency of the HOLY GHOST was enounced with a stronger emphasis, as the period of His direct and universal agency in the Church approached. However clear the passages in the Old Testament relating to His Person may seem to us to be, we find even "certain disciples" mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, who were "baptized unto John's baptism," and who yet could reply to S. Paul's inquiry, "Have ye received the HOLY GHOST since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any HOLY GHOST."<sup>m</sup> The passages, which we do find, admit such a construction as evades the consequences of direct categorical statements. Nor is there any reason to be alarmed at the notion of development and partially disclosed glimpses of heavenly things. For we are distinctly told by S. Paul, that the Law of Moses was "a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things;"<sup>n</sup> and again, that it "was our schoolmaster to bring us unto CHRIST, that we might be justified by faith."<sup>o</sup> Now according to the analogy of the metaphor 'school-master,' we should be led to expect a gradual process of instruction, not a direct and instant illumination. Indeed, a sound education would rather imply that the steps of instruction should be perceptible only in the general results.

Gradual Development  
of the Divinity of the  
HOLY GHOST.

<sup>m</sup> Acts xix. 2.

<sup>o</sup> Gal. iii. 24.

<sup>n</sup> Heb. x. 1.

It is recorded of the Apostles that they understood not CHRIST's sayings; and therefore He promised that "the Comforter, which is the HOLY GHOST, should teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever He had said unto them."<sup>p</sup> So we need not be surprised, if passages, which to us enlightened by the Gospel of Truth are instinct with high and mysterious meaning, conveyed but an indistinct and dreamy impression to the Jewish mind. Many thinkers may have pondered wistfully on the phenomena, which are said to have led Columbus to the discovery of the American continent or Newton to that of the laws of gravitation, and may have been on the very verge of the solution; but let the discovery have been once effected, and it remains a possession for ever. So before the Gospel it would be difficult to explain all the notices of the SPIRIT of GOD by attributing them to a mere personification on the part of the sacred writer; while at the same time the Unity of the Godhead was so clearly proclaimed, that any notion arising above that of His being an influence or an attribute would seem to seriously impair its integrity. For example, in such passages as, "The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue;"<sup>q</sup> "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy Presence?"<sup>r</sup> "And now the LORD GOD, and His Spirit, hath sent me;"<sup>s</sup> "But they rebelled, and vexed His Holy Spirit;"<sup>t</sup> it is impossible not to feel the entire inadequacy of any exposition which would reduce to a mere influence or operation One Who is associated with GOD and represented as speaking, sending, and being vexed; while nevertheless a categorical statement of His Personal Divinity was still wanting.

In selecting Scripture proof then of the Personality and Divinity of the HOLY GHOST, we are constrained by the very consideration of development, which has been urged, to seek it in the pages of the New rather than of the Old Testament. And, as has been already said, the cardinal proof to a believer

<sup>p</sup> S. John xiv. 26.

<sup>q</sup> 2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

<sup>r</sup> Ps. cxxxix. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Isa. xlviii. 16.

<sup>t</sup> Ib. lxiii 10.

must be the sacred formula, whereby he was admitted to the company of all faithful people, "in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST;"<sup>u</sup> and as the Apostle writes, "One LORD, one faith, one baptism."<sup>v</sup> "Who shall not be compelled by the truth itself to acknowledge the equality of the HOLY TRINITY, while there is one faith in the FATHER and the SON and the HOLY GHOST, and Baptism is given and confirmed in their name?"<sup>w</sup> 2. The SPIRIT was personally present to our LORD's Human Nature, when He became as it were an unction and was inseparably conjoined with it; as it is written, "Upon whom thou shalt see the SPIRIT descending, and remaining on him, the same is He which baptizeth with the HOLY GHOST;"<sup>x</sup> and, "GOD anointed JESUS of Nazareth with the HOLY GHOST and with power."<sup>y</sup> And every action of JESUS was performed with the presence of the SPIRIT, as in the instance of the temptation; "Then was JESUS led up of the SPIRIT into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil;"<sup>z</sup> where the personality of the HOLY GHOST is clearly contrasted with that of the ghostly Tempter. 3. "Moreover, by the confession of all, the HOLY GHOST is the immutable Sanctifier, the Giver of Divine knowledge and all good things; and, in short, Himself subsists in those good things which are granted by the LORD. For Matthew and Luke describing the same passage of the Gospel say, 'How much more shall your FATHER which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him'? the other, 'How much more shall your heavenly FATHER give the HOLY SPIRIT to them that ask Him?'"<sup>a</sup>

"From which passages it appears that the HOLY GHOST is the fulness of the gifts of GOD, and that those things which are divinely administered subsist not without Him; because all utilities received from the gifts of GOD proceed from that source. But that which is substantially good cannot admit extraneous goodness, when Itself gives goodness to others. Therefore it is clear that the HOLY GHOST is extraneous not only

<sup>u</sup> S. Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>v</sup> Eph. iv. 5.

<sup>w</sup> Didymus Alexandrinus, De Spiritu Sancto, Lib. ii. ap. S. Hieronymi Opp. Tom. VI. p. 224.

<sup>x</sup> S. John i. 33.

<sup>y</sup> Acts x. 38.

<sup>z</sup> S. Matt. iv. 1.

<sup>a</sup> S. Matt. vii. 11; S. Luke xi. 13.



to corporal but also to incorporeal creatures ; because other substances receive this substance of sanctification ; but He not only does not admit sanctification from another, but is besides the Giver and Creator thereof. Lastly, they who enjoy His fellowship are called partakers of the HOLY GHOST, to wit, being sanctified by Him. For it is clearly written, that he who hath done despite unto the SPIRIT of Grace is worthy of sorer punishment.<sup>b</sup> But if he was sanctified through the communion of the HOLY GHOST, it is shown that he was partaker of Him, and the HOLY GHOST the Giver of sanctification."<sup>c</sup> To this argument, that the human soul and indeed any other created intellect cannot properly be said to be filled by aught inferior to the Supreme Being Who made it ; and therefore that, when we read of holy men in Scripture being filled with the HOLY GHOST, it is a proof of His Divinity and Personality ; it is objected, that Satan also is said to fill the hearts of evil men ; as in the case of Judas, " After the sop Satan entered into him ; " <sup>d</sup> and of Ananias, " Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the HOLY GHOST ? " <sup>e</sup> It is replied, that the devil, observing by certain outward emotions and workings to what vices the heart of Judas (for example) was most inclined, sent a corresponding suggestion into his mind. His entrance then was not according to substance but according to operation ; for to enter into another's being or substance belongs to that uncreated Nature, Which is participated in by many.<sup>f</sup>

4. " Whosoever speaketh against the HOLY GHOST, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." <sup>g</sup> This denunciation refers to the period when the Comforter should have come, and God's ultimate Gift of Personal Love be given to abide in men's hearts, so that persistent rebellion against His ' sweet influences ' should partake of the character of devilish malignity, and the old example be renewed, when " the wrath of the LORD arose against His people, till there was no remedy." <sup>h</sup> Coupled

<sup>b</sup> Heb. x. 29.

<sup>c</sup> Didymus. Lib. i. *circ. initium*.

<sup>d</sup> S. John xiii. 27.

<sup>e</sup> Acts v. 3.

<sup>f</sup> Didym. Lib. iii. *circ. finem*.

<sup>g</sup> S. Matt. xii. 32.

<sup>h</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 16.

with this denunciation is the assurance, that "whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him;" but this was said before the Atoning Sacrifice was offered, and the SON had resumed "the glory which He had with the FATHER before the world was."<sup>1</sup> Now He is joined in that Divine jealousy which guards the Majesty of the SPIRIT. For, saith S. Paul, "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the SON of GOD, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the SPIRIT of grace?"<sup>2</sup> And CHRIST saith of Himself, "But whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My FATHER Which is in heaven."<sup>3</sup> The irremissible character of persistent sin against the SON and HOLY GHOST is a fair argument of their co-equal Divinity with the FATHER; as we read in the Old Testament, "If one man sin against another, the judge shall judge him: but if a man sin against the LORD, who shall intreat for him?"<sup>4</sup>

5. "Nor is it to no purpose that a created spirit is now expressed without the article, which in Greek signifies singularity; when almost always the HOLY SPIRIT is named with the article, as in the verse *Αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα*, 'The SPIRIT Itself beareth witness with our spirit';<sup>m</sup> and elsewhere, *Αὐτός ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιεῖν*, 'It is the SPIRIT that quickeneth';<sup>n</sup> and again, 'Even so the things of GOD knoweth no man, but the SPIRIT of GOD,' (*τὸ Πνεῦμα*), (*τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα*) 'for the SPIRIT searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of GOD.'<sup>o</sup> But whereas the HOLY SPIRIT is seldom named without the article, you must know that He is named with an addition signifying His magnificence. If indeed He is sometimes named even without the article, when not Himself personally but the participation of Him is shown; as, for instance, 'the spirit of Elias,'<sup>p</sup> 'walk after the SPIRIT,'<sup>q</sup> and if there be similar passages to these."<sup>r</sup>

<sup>1</sup> S. John xvii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. x. 29.

<sup>3</sup> S. Matt. x. 33.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 25.

<sup>m</sup> Rom. viii. 16.

<sup>n</sup> S. John vi. 63.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 11, 10.

<sup>p</sup> S. Luke i. 17.

<sup>q</sup> Rom. viii. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Didym. Lib. i. p. 222.

6. Our LORD applies the aptitude for receiving the SPIRIT to those who received His doctrine, thereby exhibiting the equality of operation in the Two Divine Persons. "The SPIRIT of Truth; Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."<sup>a</sup> But the world being given up to fleshly lusts could not receive the SPIRIT; whereas CHRIST's disciples being purified by His teaching are emancipated from the dominion of the flesh; "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you."<sup>t</sup>

7. The Apostles, when they quote the Prophets, refer their sayings clearly and objectively to the HOLY GHOST; as S. Peter, "Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the HOLY GHOST by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas;"<sup>u</sup> and S. Paul; "Well spake the HOLY GHOST by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand."<sup>v</sup>

8. S. Peter's saying to Ananias, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God;"<sup>w</sup> and presently to Sapphira, "How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the SPIRIT of the LORD?"<sup>x</sup> declares that what is sin against the HOLY GHOST is also sin against GOD, therefore the HOLY GHOST is GOD.

9. The Personality of the HOLY SPIRIT is shown in many passages; as in that where the Apostles write, "It seemed good to the HOLY GHOST and to us."<sup>y</sup> The expression 'it seemed good to' cannot be applied to an operation, but requires Personal correspondence, especially when a similar form is applied to GOD elsewhere, as in the Psalm, "Whatsoever the LORD pleased, that did He in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and in all deep places."<sup>z</sup> The words of the SPIRIT, as of a Person, are recorded; "As they ministered unto the LORD, and fasted, the HOLY GHOST said, Separate

<sup>a</sup> S. John xiv. 17.

<sup>t</sup> *Ib.* xv. 3.

<sup>u</sup> Acts i. 16.

<sup>v</sup> Acts xxviii. 25.

<sup>w</sup> Acts v. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Acts v. 9.

<sup>y</sup> Acts xv. 28.

<sup>z</sup> Ps. cxxxv. 6.

Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them ;”<sup>a</sup> words, indicating Divinity as well as Authority, and manifesting not a created but an uncreated substance. But the ministry, to which the SPIRIT separated Paul and Barnabas, was that of the FATHER and of the SON ; as S. Paul saith ; “ For He that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles ;”<sup>b</sup> and S. John, “ That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us : and truly our fellowship is with the FATHER, and with His SON JESUS CHRIST ;”<sup>c</sup> and, “ Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of CHRIST, and stewards of the mysteries of GOD.”<sup>d</sup>

10. S. Paul charges the Episcopate of the Church of Ephesus, “ Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the HOLY GHOST hath made you overseers.”<sup>e</sup> If then the HOLY GHOST hath set over the Church those whom CHRIST sent to teach and baptize the nations, and whom GOD the FATHER allowed,<sup>f</sup> there is no doubt that there is one and the same operation and allowance of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, and consequently the same substance of the TRINITY.

11. Another argument is grounded on the SPIRIT’s being said in Scripture to be *given* to men. S. Paul saith, “ The love of GOD is shed abroad in our hearts by the HOLY GHOST which is given unto us ;”<sup>g</sup> and our LORD Himself, “ How much more shall your Heavenly FATHER give the HOLY SPIRIT to them that ask Him ?”<sup>h</sup> That SPIRIT is also said to have been poured forth by GOD over all flesh, that they who have received Him may prophesy and see visions, according to Joel, who speaks in the person of GOD ; “ And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My SPIRIT upon all flesh ; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.”<sup>i</sup> “ For the effusion of the SPIRIT,” saith

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiii. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Gal. ii. 8.

<sup>c</sup> 1 S. John i. 3.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Acts xx. 28.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Thess. ii. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Rom. v. 5.

<sup>h</sup> S. Luke xi. 13.

<sup>i</sup> Joel ii. 28.

Didymus, "became the cause of prophesying and of seeing the meaning and beauty of Truth. The very name also of *effusion* proves the substance of the HOLY SPIRIT to be uncreate. For when GOD sends an angel or other creature, He doth not say, 'I will pour out My Angel or Principality or Throne or Dominion.' Inasmuch as this language agrees with such things only as are participated by others, as we have said just now of the love of GOD, which is shed abroad in the hearts of those who have received the HOLY GHOST. Our SAVIOUR also, because He Himself admits of being received, is said to be poured out like ointment; 'Thy Name is as ointment poured forth.'<sup>j</sup> For ointment contained in a vessel hath indeed the substance of fragrance, but is hindered from being widely diffused because it is shut up in the vessel; but when the vessel is emptied it sends forth its fragrance. So the Name of CHRIST, fragrant before His Advent, was employed among the people of Israel alone; 'In Judah is GOD known: His Name is great in Israel.'<sup>k</sup> But when the incarnate SAVIOUR extended His Name to all the earth or rather to every creature, that being fulfilled which is written, 'How excellent is Thy Name in all the earth!'<sup>l</sup> consequently whereupon the Apostle saith 'There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved;<sup>m</sup> and the Psalmist saith to the LORD, 'Thou hast magnified Thy Name and Thy Word above all things;<sup>n</sup> then was fulfilled the saying, 'Thy Name is as ointment poured out.'<sup>o</sup>

12. The SPIRIT is called LORD equally with the FATHER and the SON, as where S. Paul describes the carnal condition of the Jews; "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the LORD, the vail shall be taken away. Now the LORD is that SPIRIT: and where the SPIRIT of the LORD is, there is liberty. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the LORD, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as though from the LORD the SPIRIT."<sup>p</sup>

<sup>j</sup> Canticles i. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Ps. lxxvi. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Ps. viii. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Acts iv. 12.

<sup>n</sup> Ps. cxxxviii. 2.

<sup>o</sup> Didym. Lib. i. p. 220.

<sup>p</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 15-18. καθάπερ ἀπὸ  
Κυρίου Πνεύματος.

"He," says S. Basil, "who hath been enabled to penetrate the depth of the meaning of the Law, and rending the obscurity which veils the letter gets at its secrets, he imitates Moses, when conversing with GOD he took off his vail, himself also turning from the letter to the spirit. So that the obscurity of the teachings of the Law answers to the vail on Moses' face, and the spiritual contemplation to his turning to the LORD. He then who in the reading of the Law taketh away the letter turns to the LORD, (but the LORD now is called the SPIRIT); and becomes like Moses, with his face glorified from the manifestation of GOD. For like as things, lying beside florid hues, themselves also derive colour from the circumfluent splendour; so he who clearly gazes on the SPIRIT is in a manner transfigured by reason of His glory to something brighter, beaming in heart with the truth that proceeds from the SPIRIT as with a light."<sup>a</sup>

13. "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the HOLY GHOST which is in you, which ye have of GOD, and ye are not your own?"<sup>r</sup> "When therefore the HOLY GHOST," says Didymus, "like as the FATHER and the SON, is reported to dwell in the mind and inner man, I will not say it is silly, but it is impious, to call Him a creature. For virtues and arts, and the perturbations and ignorances and affections contrary to them, may dwell in souls; not however substantially, but accidentally. But that a created nature should inhabit sense is impossible. But if it is true, that the HOLY GHOST subsisting without any ambiguity dwelleth in the heart and soul, it is clear that with the FATHER and the SON He should be believed to be uncreate."<sup>s</sup> 14. "But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship GOD, and report that GOD is in you of a truth."<sup>t</sup> Here GOD is recognised to be in the Church from the gift of prophecy; which with other gifts "worketh that one and the

<sup>a</sup> S. Basil. De S. Spiritu, cap. 21, p. 198.

<sup>r</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 19.

<sup>s</sup> Didym. Lib. ii. p. 224.

<sup>t</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25.

self-same SPIRIT, dividing to every man severally as He will." \*

15. "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the HOLY GHOST which is in you, which ye have of GOD, and ye are not your own?" † But Scripture never applies the word 'temple' to the service of one less than the ALMIGHTY, except in the mere historical mention of what the Heathens termed 'temples.' 16. "And the LORD direct your hearts into the love of GOD, and into the patience of CHRIST." ‡ Who is the LORD that should direct those early converts from heathenism into the love of their Divine FATHER and CHRIST-like patience of afflictions, which the profession of the Name of CHRIST exposed them to, Who but the SPIRIT? For "no man can say that JESUS is the LORD, but by the HOLY GHOST." § In like manner S. Paul calls the SPIRIT *Lord*, distinguishing Him from the other two Persons, as the special Worker of Divine Love in us, inasmuch as He is Love. "And the LORD make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you: to the end He may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before GOD, even our FATHER, at the coming of our LORD JESUS CHRIST with all His saints." ¶

Of His Pro-  
cession, and  
of the Filio-  
que clause.

§. 2. The Procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER has already been necessarily noticed in treating of the Divine Processions, namely, the Generation of the SON by the FATHER, and the Spiration of the SPIRIT from the FATHER and the SON. Little would need to be said on the subject, seeing that it rests on one text of Scripture only; were it not that it lies in the fore-front of the schism between the East and West, and requires to be treated with reference to Catholic Tradition. Here (if anywhere) would the scoffers against Tradition delight to point to a crucial experiment, where it has signally failed. For if two great divisions of the Church have failed to agree on so abstract a point, one so remotely affecting the great dogmas of the Faith, how can the testimony of Tradition be allowed to seriously influence our

\* 1 Cor. xii. 11.

† 1 Cor. vi. 19.

‡ 2 Thess. iii. 5.

\* 1 Cor. xii. 3.

† 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13.

judgment in other matters, which more obviously affect our hopes and fears, our passions and affections? I cannot but think however that the testimony of Tradition in this matter is explicit and decisive enough, if only allowed to have its due weight. But the passions, prejudices, and interests of men are enlisted against it; and it is hopeless to expect large bodies or communities to relinquish their inherited errors or innovations, until it shall please the Divine Comforter "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just."\*

It is simply a matter of history that the *Filioque* clause, whereby the Church professes to believe that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from the SON as well as from the FATHER, is an unauthorised addition to the Creed of Constantinople. It is not denied except by extreme dogmatists that the intention of the Westerns in proposing the *Filioque* clause was orthodox; but the assumption thereof without adequate authority, that is, a representation of the Universal Church, cannot but be regarded as an early symptom of that impatience of authority and rude disregard of fraternal unity, which has but too surely led to the substitution of the mere shiftings of individual will for the dogmatism of the Faith. If the testimony of the last great General Council, which expressed the dogma of the undivided Church Catholic, fails to secure our assent, it is downright mockery to pretend to parade a fragmentary exhibition of Church authority, while we disregard its integral force. Thus the Synod of Chalcedon, in their Address to the Emperor Marcian, noticing the work of the Synod of Constantinople in rejecting the heresy of Macedonius, mentions that they declared the SPIRIT "according to the meaning of the faith to be LORD and GOD and having His procession of the FATHER,"\* without mention of the SON. The Eastern Liturgies are formed in the same mould. For example, take the Syro-Jacobite Liturgy of S. Xystus, Pope of Rome, where the Priest prays thus; "Sanctify these oblations through the illapse of Thy HOLY SPIRIT, Which proceedeth from Thee

\* S. Luke i. 17.

\* καὶ Πατὴρ ἔχον τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν.

Conc. Chalced. Part III. *ap.* Labbe.  
Tom. IV. p. 822.



from eternity, and receiveth substantially from Thy SON.”<sup>b</sup> And in that of Matthew the Shepherd; “Send the Comforter, the SPIRIT of Truth, Which proceedeth perpetually from Thee, and receiveth of the SON what is of substance.”<sup>c</sup> In the eighth century we find this distinction fixed in the language of the Church. Damascene speaks of the SPIRIT as “proceeding from the FATHER and resting in the SON,” as “imparted through the SON,”<sup>d</sup> and as “proceeding from the FATHER through the SON.”<sup>e</sup> And as his Exposition of the Orthodox Faith is founded on the *dicta* of the great Doctors of the Eastern Church, Athanasius, Gregory, Basil, and Chrysostom, it may be safely assumed that it gives a correct view of the general teaching of that extensive Communion. But was the language of the West different in the early centuries? I think the following instances will prove that it was not. “I think,” says Tertullian, “that the SPIRIT is not from elsewhere than from the FATHER through the SON.”<sup>f</sup> Pelagius, in his Profession of Faith sent to Pope Innocent (A.D. 417), says; “We believe also in the HOLY GHOST, Very GOD, proceeding from the FATHER, equal throughout to the FATHER and the SON, in will, power, eternity, substance.”<sup>g</sup> The testimony of some of the most ancient Western Liturgies is concordant; as in the Gallican Sacramentary, in the running commentary supplied on the Creed, when it was delivered to Catechumens on Palm Sunday, we read; “This is the HOLY SPIRIT, Which proceedeth from the FATHER,” without mention of the SON:<sup>h</sup> and again in one of the Sunday *Præfationes Missæ*; “The HOLY GHOST is One, proceeding from the FATHER, co-eternal with the FATHER and the SON.”<sup>i</sup>

The reason of assigning the Procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER, without mention of the SON, is given by Didymus: “By an ineffable language therefore, and known by faith only, it is to be believed that the SAVIOUR is said to

<sup>b</sup> Renaudot. *Liturgiæ Orientales*, Tom. II. p. 136.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* p. 349.

<sup>d</sup> Cap. 8.

<sup>e</sup> Cap. 13.

<sup>f</sup> “Quia Spiritum non aliunde puto quam a Patre per Filium.”

Tert. Adv. Praxeam. c. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Libellus Fidei Pelagii, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1664.

<sup>h</sup> “Qui egreditur a Patre.” Sacrament. Gallicanum, *ap.* Mabillon. Museum Italicum, Tom. I. p. 313.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* p. 376.

have come forth from GOD,<sup>j</sup> and the SPIRIT of Truth to proceed from the FATHER. And beautifully He saith, 'Which proceedeth from the FATHER.'<sup>k</sup> For when He might have said 'from GOD' or 'from the LORD' or 'from the ALMIGHTY,' he touched none of these; but He saith 'from the FATHER.' Not that the FATHER is different from GOD ALMIGHTY; but according to the property and meaning of (the term) *parent*, the SPIRIT of Truth is said to proceed from Him."<sup>l</sup> But in another place Didymus allows that the Procession of the SPIRIT from the FATHER cannot be without the mediation of the SON, because He is the SPIRIT of Truth, that is, the SPIRIT of the Word and Wisdom of GOD, Who is the LORD CHRIST. "The HOLY SPIRIT, Who is the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Wisdom, cannot, when the SON speaketh, hear that which He knoweth not; when He is that very thing which is produced by the SON, that is, proceeding from the Truth, Comforter emanating from the Comforter, GOD of GOD proceeding, the SPIRIT of Truth."<sup>m</sup> S. Hilary also adheres to the strict letter of Scripture, while he maintains the indifferency of the phrases 'proceeding from the FATHER' and 'receiving of the SON.' "'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the SPIRIT of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: and He will shew you things to come. He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the FATHER hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall shew it unto you.'<sup>n</sup> He receiveth then from the SON, Who both is sent by Him and proceedeth from the FATHER; and I ask, whether receiving from the SON be the very same thing as proceeding from the FATHER. But if it is believed that there is no difference between receiving from the SON and proceeding from the FATHER, at least to receive from the SON will be thought one and the same thing as to receive from the FATHER."<sup>o</sup>

<sup>j</sup> S. John xlii. 3; xvi. 28.

<sup>k</sup> *Ibid.* xv. 26.

<sup>l</sup> Didymus, Lib. ii. p. 225.

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid.* p. 227.

<sup>n</sup> S. John xvi. 12—15.

<sup>o</sup> S. Hilar. De Trinitate, Lib. viii. p. 103.

The first instance I can find of an authoritative use of the *Filioque* clause in the West is at the Third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589); where the third Canon saith; "Whoever doth not believe or hath not believed that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from the FATHER and the SON, and saith not that He is co-eternal with the FATHER and the SON and co-equal, let him be anathema." <sup>p</sup> The Franks and Germans also admitted it in the seventh century. The addition acquired strength in the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, which was celebrated A.D. 809. A deputation was appointed from this Synod to Pope Leo III., to consult him about the addition and the propriety of chaunting it in the Creed. The Pope approved of the decree of the Synod touching the Procession of the SPIRIT from the SON, but would not sanction the addition of the words *Filioque* to the Creed of Constantinople. And when the Legates asked, whether the Fathers of Constantinople would not have done better in inserting into their Creed four syllables, whereby so necessary a mystery of Faith might be rendered conspicuous to all succeeding ages, the Pope replied; 'As I dare not say that they would not have done well if they had done so; because doubtless as other things, which they even omitted, they did knowingly, and enlightened not so much by human as by Divine wisdom; so also I dare not say that they understood that less than ourselves; they weighed why they dismissed it, or when dismissed forbade its further insertion, as also they did other things. Thou and thine look to it what ye think of us. For I do not say that I should not prefer myself to them; but be it even far from me to presume to make myself their equal.' <sup>q</sup> This conference had no practical result. In France they continued to chaunt the Creed with the *Filioque* clause; at Rome they continued not to chaunt it. Only the Pope, for the preservation of the Faith, caused two

<sup>p</sup> Conc. Toletani iii. Canon 3, *ap. Labbe*, Tom. V. p. 1004. It occurs also in the Fourth of Toledo, A.D. 633; in the Sixth, chap. i.; and in the Eighth celebrated under King Receswinth.

<sup>q</sup> I give these words from the original by the Abbat Smaragdus, called, 'Ratio quæ habita est de

Symbolo Fidei in secretario S. Petri Apostoli inter domnum Leonem sanctissimum et co-evangelicum Papam urbis Romæ et Bernarium atque Jesse episcopos seu Adalardum abbatem, missos domni Caroli Imperatoris per indictionem II.,' *ap. Labbe*, Tom. VII. p. 1197.

tablets of silver to be suspended in the basilica of S. Peter, on the right and left at the entrance of the shrine or sepulchre ; whereon the Creed was written, on the one in Greek, on the other in Latin. "The disputes which were mooted on this subject in consequence between the Greeks and Latins make us see," says Fleury, "how wise the decision of the Pope was."<sup>r</sup>

Leo III. was not the first Pope, who maintained the ancient Faith of the Eastern Church against Gallican innovations. The Author of the Caroline Book against the Second Nicene Synod inveighs against the Patriarch Tarasius, because he had made use of the old orthodox language, that the SPIRIT proceedeth from the FATHER through the SON. "It doth not follow," saith he, "that our dispute turn on this, that Tarasius confessed not that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from the FATHER only, like some, who, although they somehow were silent about His proceeding from the SON, yet quite believed Him to proceed from the FATHER and the SON, as all the Church universally confesses and believes Him to proceed; but that in his Profession of Faith he confessed Him to proceed from the FATHER through the SON. In which Profession unless there be purity and sincerity of heart, which believes Him to be not a creature but the Creator, nor inferior to the FATHER and the SON, but equal to Them and consubstantial, and to proceed from Both, a pernicious infection may arise. \* \* For it is rightly believed and usually confessed, that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from the FATHER and the SON, not from the FATHER through the SON : for He doth not proceed through the SON, as a creature which was made by Him, nor as if posterior in time, or less in power, or of another substance ; but is believed to proceed from the FATHER and the SON, as co-eternal, as consubstantial, as co-equal, as of one glory, power, and Divinity, with Them existing."<sup>s</sup>

It is clear from the concluding sentence, that the idea uppermost in the minds of the advocates of the *Filioque* was the necessity of guarding against any conception of inferiority of the HOLY GHOST to the SON ; yet they did not well to take Scripture passages, which relate to His Mission *in time* by

<sup>r</sup> Fleury, *Histoire du Christianisme*, L. xlv. c. 48.

<sup>s</sup> *Libri Carolini adversus Imagines Auctor*, Lib. iii. c. 3, p. 303.

the SON, and apply them to His *eternal* Procession. They might learn from the favourite Patristic illustration of the Unity and relations which exist between the Persons of the Blessed TRINITY by the comparison of a stream, which has its hidden well-head, its gushing fount, and its proceeding volume of mighty waters ; or again, with the sun, the parent of genial heat through the intermediate sunbeam. The waters proceed from the hidden source and the visible fountain ; but mediately from the latter, and ultimately from the former. Yet if we strictly searched for the origin of the stream, we should point out the furthest object to which our investigations could possibly attain. So with regard to the heat ; it is ultimately referred to the sun, though the sunbeam be the *medium* whereby it reaches us. And in the Blessed TRINITY the SPIRIT proceedeth from the FATHER through the SON, because the FATHER is the well and hidden spring of Divinity ; yet in the SON and through Him, because “in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead,” and because “He and the FATHER are one ;” so that to imagine any derogation from the co-eternal Divinity of the SON, because we say that the SPIRIT proceedeth from the FATHER only, has no more real ground than if we should suppose a dishonour done to the co-equal majesty of the HOLY GHOST, because we say that the SON is begotten of the FATHER only. It arises from the tendency of the human mind to introduce the relations of Time into the essence of Eternity, and to apply to the Divine Nature the logical conditions of our own existence. It is thus that Pope Hadrian I. replies to the Caroline Book, and defends the Patriarch Tarasius : “Tarasius explained not this dogma by himself, but confessed it by the teaching of the holy Fathers ; articles of whom we briefly write according to the very great love which we bear towards your most exalted God-protected Royal Excellency.”<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Hadriani P.P. I. Epist. ad Carolum Regem pro Nicæna Synodo II. *ap.* Labbe, Tom. VII. p. 916. His most apposite quotations are from S. Athanasius, De Virginitate, Tom. I. p. 1043 ; and S. Hilary, De Trinitate, Lib. viii. p. 105. Fleury remarks ; “Il commence par sou-

tenir ce que Taraise avoir dit, que le Saint Esprit procède du Père par le Fils, et emploie pour ce sujet plusieurs autorités des Pères. Cette réponse est remarquable en ce qu'elle fait voir que l'Eglise Romaine ne reprochoit rien alors aux Grecs sur ce sujet.” L. xlv. c. 59.

The moderation of these Popes appears to have been imitated by the greatest genius of the dark ages, I mean, Johannes Scotus Erigena. He thus writes: "None of the Faithful doubts that the SON is born of One Cause, that is, of the FATHER; but as to the HOLY GHOST, whether He proceeds from One Cause, namely, the FATHER, or from Two, that is, from the FATHER and the SON, I would not rashly affirm or deny; and hereby I do not sufficiently see that it does not meet the professions of the right Faith, when I have most frequently found the HOLY GHOST called the SPIRIT of the FATHER and of the SON. For He is the SPIRIT of Both, when He proceeds from the FATHER through the SON, as He is the Gift of Both, when He is given from the FATHER through the SON; and is the love of Both, joining the FATHER and the SON; as S. Augustine teaches in the books which he published 'Of the Most High and Holy TRINITY;' with admirable search seeking an image thereof in human nature, and with most clear invention declaring it; proving that the Trinity (formed after GOD's image) of our inner nature, that is, of the reasonable soul, is the mind, to wit, the principal part of the soul; and consciousness, whereby it knows itself; and love, whereby it weds itself and its consciousness. Since the human mind begetteth of itself as it were an offspring of its own, its consciousness, whereby it knows itself; and its consciousness is equal to itself because it knows itself entire after the likeness of GOD the FATHER, Who of Himself begetteth His SON, Who is His Wisdom, whereby He knoweth Himself; and is equal to Him, because He understandeth Himself entire; and is co-essential with Him, because He begetteth of Himself Whom He begetteth. From the human mind proceeds a certain appetite, which, when it has arrived at perfect knowledge, becomes love, uniting the mind and its consciousness, and equal to and co-essential with the same. When the love itself, which unites the mind and its consciousness, proceeds not from elsewhere than from the mind itself, after the image of the HOLY SPIRIT, Who proceeding from the FATHER unites the FATHER and the SON by the ineffable bond of charity." Then comparing the SPIRIT mystically with the fountain, which issued from the Garden of Eden

to water the face of the earth, he proceeds; "Deservedly then is the HOLY SPIRIT said to flow, whether from the FATHER only, or from the FATHER and the SON, because He is the fountain and origin of all virtues, and because they return to Himself by an ineffable channel through the hidden pores of our nature."<sup>u</sup>

Nor doth Aquinas, the Prince of Schoolmen, depart from the moderation of tone above exhibited; for he writes thus: "In any action whatsoever you have to consider two things, to wit, the supposed agent and the virtue whereby he acts, as fire warms by heat. If then in the FATHER and the SON the virtue be considered whereby they breathe the HOLY SPIRIT, there falls not in that case any medium, because this virtue is one and the same. But if the Persons Themselves that breathe be considered, so, when the HOLY SPIRIT proceeds in common from the FATHER and the SON, the HOLY SPIRIT is found to proceed immediately from the FATHER, as far as He is from Him; and mediately, as far as He is from the SON. And so He is said to proceed from the FATHER through the SON. As also Abel proceeded immediately from Adam, as far as Adam was his father; and mediately, as far as Eve, who proceeded from Adam, was his mother; although this example of material procession may seem unfit to signify the immaterial procession of the Divine Persons."<sup>v</sup>

§. 3. Objections have been raised against the co-equal Majesty and Divinity of the SPIRIT, because He is said in Scripture to be *sent* and to be *given*. But first, the objection applies equally to the LOGOS, and has been met in the course

Of the  
Mission of  
the HOLY  
GHOST.

<sup>u</sup> Johannes Scotus Erigena, De Divisione Naturæ, Lib. ii. §. 31, pp. 85, 86. Ed. Gale, Oxon. 1681. Another saying of his deserves attention: "Ad cumulum quoque obscuritatis augetur, quod symbolum fidei secundum Græcos a Nicæna Synodo traditum, a Patre solummodo Spiritum Sanctum procedere profiteatur, teste Epiphanio Cypri Episcopo, in libro suo De Fide. Juxta vero Latinos, a Patre et Filio; quamvis in quibusdam Græcorum expositionibus eundem Spiritum a Patre per Filium procedere

reperiamus. Ideoque præsentis questionis difficultate repercussus contrariis cogitationum fluctibus allidor." *Ibid.* p. 85.

<sup>v</sup> S. Tho. Aquin. Summ. I. qu. xxxvi. art. 3. So also Durandus; "Sic cum inter Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum Filius sit tamquam media Persona virtutem spirandi a Patre recipiens, potest dici quod Pater producit Spiritum Sanctum mediante Filio, sub eodem sensu potest dici quod Pater producit Spiritum Sanctum per Filium." Lib. i. Dist. 12, qu. 3. §. 4.

of exhibiting the Scripture proof of His Divinity. It was urged in S. Basil's time, and thus answered: "The SPIRIT is in us as a gift from GOD; but the gift surely is not revered with equal honours as the giver. The SPIRIT indeed is a gift of GOD, but a gift of life; for, saith He, 'the law of the SPIRIT of life hath made me free;' <sup>w</sup> and a gift of power; for 'ye shall receive power, after that the HOLY GHOST is come upon you.' <sup>x</sup> Is He then on this account to be despised? Or did not the FATHER also give the SON to men? For, 'He that spared not His own SON, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?' <sup>y</sup> and elsewhere, speaking of the mystery of the Incarnation, 'that ye might know the things that are freely given to us of GOD.' <sup>z</sup> Secondly, the mission implies no disparagement. "The HOLY SPIRIT, the Comforter," says Didymus, "is sent by the SON, not according to the ministry of Angels or of Prophets or Apostles, but as it becomes the Spirit of GOD to be sent by Wisdom and Truth, having His nature undivided along with the same Wisdom and Truth. For the Son too being sent by the FATHER is not separated from Him, remaining in Him, and having Him in Himself." <sup>a</sup> The Mission of the SPIRIT, Who is the Author of sanctification, was originally indicated by outward symbols, as a dove, a mighty wind, and cloven fiery tongues, wherein He was present as the Thing signified in the Sacrament or thing signifying. Nor was it necessary that the visible or sensible symbol of His Presence should be assumed into unity of Person, because it was required not as a medium of action, but simply to indicate by way of solemn inauguration an internal and spiritual fact. For "it is not necessary to an invisible mission, that it be always manifested through some outward visible sign; but, as it is said, 'The manifestation of the SPIRIT is given to every man,' <sup>b</sup> to wit, for the profit of the Church. Which profit indeed is, that by visible signs of this sort the Faith may be confirmed and propagated: which was

<sup>w</sup> Rom. viii. 2.

<sup>x</sup> Acts i. 8.

<sup>y</sup> Rom. viii. 32.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 12. S. Basil. De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 24.

<sup>a</sup> Didymus. Lib. ii. p. 225.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 7.



principally done through CHRIST and the Apostles, according to the text, 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the LORD, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him?'<sup>c</sup> And therefore a visible mission of the HOLY GHOST ought specially to have been made to CHRIST and to the Apostles and to some primitive Saints, on whom in a manner the Church was founded; so however, that the visible mission made to CHRIST should demonstrate the invisible mission made to Him, not at that time, but in the beginning of His Conception. But a visible mission was made to CHRIST in His Baptism under the form of a dove, to show in CHRIST the authority of granting grace through spiritual regeneration, (whence the voice of the FATHER thundered, 'This is My beloved SON'); that after the likeness of the Only-Begotten others might be regenerated. In the Transfiguration under the form of a bright cloud, to show the exuberance of doctrine; whence it was said, 'Hear Him.'<sup>d</sup> But to the Apostles under the form of wind, to show the power of the Ministry in the dispensation of the Sacraments; whence it was said to them, 'Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.'<sup>e</sup> And under fiery tongues, to show the office of teaching; whence it is said, that they 'began to speak with other tongues.'<sup>f</sup> But to the fathers of the Old Testament no visible mission of the HOLY GHOST ought to have been made; because the visible mission of the SON ought to have been accomplished before that of the HOLY GHOST, when the HOLY GHOST should manifest the SON, as the SON the FATHER."<sup>g</sup>

<sup>c</sup> Heb. ii. 3.

<sup>d</sup> S. Matt. ix. 7.

<sup>e</sup> S. John xx. 23.

<sup>f</sup> Acts ii. 4.

<sup>g</sup> S. Tho. Summ. I. qu. 43, art. 7,  
*ad finem.*

## CHAPTER VIII.

## OF THE HOLY ANGELS.

§. 1. HAVING treated of the internal Processions in the Divine Nature, which make up the Holy and Undivided TRINITY, it follows that we notice the external processions, which are originated by but are separate from It, not only in our conception of them but also in fact. Such are the operations and creatures brought into being from not-being by Divine Omnipotence. Creation is defined as "the production of something according to its entire substance, nothing being presupposed that should be either uncreate or created by some one. Whence it remains that nothing can create anything except GOD only, Who is the First Cause. And therefore Moses, to show that all bodily substances were created immediately by GOD, said, "In the beginning GOD created the heaven and the earth."<sup>a</sup> Here it might be supposed that Moses merely meant the original pre-formation of physical materials, at present existing in the visible forms of the universe. But beside that in the analysis of Creation we should expect to meet with immaterial and spiritual substances preceding the formation of the crass and material elements, we find mention of certain mysterious beings called Cherubim in attendance on the Almighty, coming close on the brief record of Man's creation, probation, and fall, without any direct announcement of how they came into existence.

Of the Existence of Angels.

We may then assume that in the first verse of the book of Genesis is contained a comprehensive intimation of the production of the seminal reasons of those concrete forms which exist in the universe. And as the object of the sacred writer

<sup>a</sup> S. Tho. Summ. I. qu. 65, art. 3.

was simply to record as much as was necessary to introduce that elaborate machinery destined to restore Man to union with his Maker, whereof the Mosaic Law was a portion, he proceeds to trace the successive steps of the earth's creation; leaving us in the dark as to whether a corresponding development obtained in other and higher worlds, or whether by reason of the perfection of spiritual natures their composition bears no comparison with visible things such as allow of historical narration. S. Paul however distinctly refers the creation of these spiritual substances to the Wisdom or WORD of GOD in connection with the creation of the visible universe: though, as the conditions of Time could not exist (as they are known to us) before the completion of the visible world, we are not bound to regard the two portions as if they came under the same conditions. "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."<sup>1</sup> It is not then a matter of indifference, that we accept or reject the doctrine concerning the existence and offices of these blessed Spirits: for the Church condemns the infidelity of the old Sadducees, who said "that there is neither angel nor spirit,"<sup>j</sup> by proclaiming in the Creed that God is "Maker of all things visible and invisible." Nor is it an idle thought to contemplate them as next to the Divine Essence; for when Isaiah saw the glory of the LORD, he saw Him attended by the Seraphim;<sup>k</sup> and David sings that "the chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels;"<sup>l</sup> and Ezekiel informs us that they were Cherubim. "This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar; and I knew that they were the cherubims."<sup>m</sup> They are called by the generic name of *Angels* or 'Messengers,' because the highest dignity of a creature is to be assumed as it were into fellowship with his Creator in the prosecution of beneficence; as it is written,

<sup>1</sup> Col. i. 16, 17.<sup>j</sup> Acts xxiii. 8.<sup>k</sup> Isa. vi. 2.<sup>l</sup> Ps. lxxviii. 17.<sup>m</sup> Ezek. x. 20.

"It is more blessed to give than to receive." <sup>n</sup> And David apostrophises them; "Bless the LORD, ye His angels, that excel in strength, that do His commandments, hearkening unto the voice of His word. Bless ye the LORD, all ye His hosts; ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure." <sup>o</sup> And, as Didymus remarks, "The wishes of perfect men and such as arrive at consummate sanctity are to become equal to angels: forasmuch as angels render aid to men, and not men to angels; ministering salvation to them and announcing to them larger benefits of God. Whence is clearly shown that Angels are more honourable and far better than men, through a more germane (so to say) and fuller participation of the TRINITY." <sup>p</sup>

An Angel then may be described, according to Damascene, as "an intellectual being, ever in motion, possessing free will, incorporeal, ministering to GOD, by grace having an immortal nature, the form and limit of whose being the Creator alone knoweth. But an Angel is called incorporeal and immaterial as far as relates to us: for everything, being compared to GOD the Alone Incomparable, is found to be crass and material; for the Divinity Alone is really immaterial and incorporeal." <sup>q</sup> The distinction here drawn by Damascene is supported by Leibniz, who denies that any rational creature is without an organised body, and that any created spirit is entirely detached from matter. (*Théodicée*, Pt. II. §. 124.) He even complains that the judgment of many Fathers on the subject had been unnecessarily set aside. (*Epist. 5 ad Des Bosses*.) Even human souls are *never*, according to him, without a certain body; no, not even when separate from their earthly bodies. (*Nouveaux Essais*, II. §. 12.)

§. 2. We are next induced to inquire, whether there exist any orders, ranks, or Hierarchies among the blessed Angels; and if so, on what authority of Scripture such a statement is made. That there are distinct orders of Angels is put beyond doubt by the express testimony of S. Paul, who saith that, "GOD, the FATHER of Glory," "set CHRIST at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all prin-

Of the Angelic Hierarchies.

<sup>n</sup> Acts xx. 35.

<sup>o</sup> Ps. ciii. 20, 21.

<sup>p</sup> Didym. Lib. i. p. 219.

<sup>q</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. cap. 18.

ciality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.”<sup>r</sup> And S. Peter saith of CHRIST, “Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of GOD; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him.”<sup>s</sup> Beside the distinction (already noticed) of Seraphim and Cherubim, the *Archangel* Michael is mentioned by S. Jude.<sup>t</sup> Classifying these names together according to the trine repetition of the mystical number, Christians have gathered from Scripture, that there are *nine* orders, namely, Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers, Virtues (or Might), Archangels, and Angels. They have even conceived themselves helped to this arrangement by a mystical interpretation of a passage in Ezekiel, believed to refer to the primacy of the apostate Archangel; “Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle.”<sup>u</sup>

Such has been the constant belief of the East and West from the time of S. John Damascene and of S. Gregory the Great and his epitomator Isidore of Seville. The Liturgies generally commemorate the Angelic Hierarchies in the *Ter Sanctus*.<sup>v</sup> But the great source, which supplied matter of speculation on this subject to succeeding ages, was the work ‘On the Heavenly Hierarchy’ ascribed to S. Dionysius the Areopagite. No work perhaps ever enjoyed so widely extended and so durable a popularity, yet experienced such

<sup>r</sup> Eph. i. 21.

<sup>s</sup> 1 S. Peter iii. 22.

<sup>t</sup> S. Jude v. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Ezek. xxviii. 13. See S. Greg. Magn. Homil. 34 in Evang. et L. xxxii. Moral. c. 18; and S. Isidor. Hispal. Sententiarum Lib. i. c. 12.

<sup>v</sup> For example, the Alexandrian Liturgy of S. Gregory in the Prayer of Oblation; Ὁ αἰνῶσιν ἄγγελοι σὲ προσκυνοῦσιν ἀρχάγγελοι σὲ ἀρχαὶ ὑμνοῦσι σὲ κυριότητες ἀνακράζουσι τὴν σὴν δόξαν ἐξοῦσαι ἀναγορεύουσι σοὶ θρόνοι τὴν εὐφροσύνην ἀναπέμπουσι χίλια χιλιάδες σοὶ παραστήκουσι καὶ

μύρια μυριάδες σοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν προσάγουσι. (Renaudot. Liturg. Oriental. Tom. I. p. 99.) And the usual Preface in the Roman Missal concludes with the words, “Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, cum Thronis et Dominationibus, cumque omni militia cœlestis exercitus, hymnum gloriæ Tuæ canimus, sine fine dicentes;” compressed in our Liturgy into “Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name.”

vicissitudes of fortune. On its first appearance in Western Europe in A.D. 880, the Abbat Hilduin hailed it as a gift from heaven;<sup>w</sup> and the genius of Aquinas accepts it with undoubting reverence. But the authority of Calvin has prevailed with the Protestants; and his successors vie with each other in exhibiting a petulant and unmeasured contempt.<sup>x</sup> A respectable testimony against its antiquity is found in the Account of a Conference between the Catholics and the Severians held at Constantinople, A.D. 533.<sup>y</sup> Cave supposes the work to be the composition of the elder Apollinarius bishop of Laodiceæ, who flourished about A.D. 362; and quotes Daillé and Casaubon in refutation of its pretensions. The latter however is singularly contented with it, as long as it is supposed to damage the Popish cause.<sup>z</sup> On the other hand, we have S. Maximus (about A.D. 640), referring to *scholia* composed by Dionysius of Alexandria on the works of his namesake; which is contradictory to Cave's hypothesis, and seems to make the work anterior to the Nicene Council.<sup>a</sup> And S. Gregory Nazianzen clearly refers to this or a similar work.<sup>b</sup> Nor is the apology offered by the Jesuit Lamsel

<sup>w</sup> Fleury. L. xlvii. c. 2.

<sup>x</sup> The words of Calvin are, "Dionysium illum, quicumque fuerit, nemo negaverit multa subtiliter et argute in Cœlesti Hierarchia disputasse: verum si quis propius excutiat, deprehendet maxima ex parte meram esse garrulitatem, Theologo autem non garriendo aures oblectare, sed vera, certa, utilia docendo, conscientias confirmare propositum est. Si librum illum legas, putes hominem de cœlo delapsum referre, non quæ didicit, sed quæ oculis vidit. Atqui Paulus, qui extra tertium cœlum raptus fuerat, non modo nihil tale prodidit, sed testatus quoque est nefas esse homini loqui quæ viderat arcana." Institution. Lib. i. cap. 14, §. 4.

<sup>y</sup> The orthodox Bishop says; "Illa enim testimonia quæ vos Dionysii Areopagitæ dicitis, unde potestis ostendere vera esse, sicut suspicamini: si enim ejus erant, non potuissent latere beatum Cy-

rillum. Quid autem de beato Cyrillo dico? quando et beatus Athanasius, si pro certo scisset ejus fuisse, ante omnia in Nicæno Concilio de consubstantiali Trinitate eadem testimonia protulisset adversus Arii diversæ substantiæ blasphemias. Si autem nullus ex antiquis recordatus est ea, unde nunc potestis ostendere quia illius sint, nescio." Collatio Constantin. ap. Labbe, Tom. IV. p. 1767.

<sup>z</sup> "Auctor est sane lectu dignissimus, et qui Pontificiorum causam aperte in multis jugulat." Cave, Hist. Liter. Tom. I. p. 177.

<sup>a</sup> See S. Maximi Scholia in S. Dion. Areopag. ad cap. v. Cœlestis Hierarchiæ.

<sup>b</sup> Οὐτῶ μὲν οὖν τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, ἃ καὶ τοῖς Χεραφίμ συγκαλύπτεται καὶ δοξάζεται, τρισὶν ἁγιασμοῖς, εἰς μίαν συνιοῦσι κυριότητα καὶ θεότητα: ὃ καὶ ἄλλῳ τινὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν πεφιλοσόφηται κάλλιστὰ τε καὶ ὑψηλότατα. S. Greg. Nazianzen. Hom. 38; Opp. Tom. I. p. 617.

for its inflated style, devoid of ingenuity ; for he refers to a corresponding example in Philo.<sup>c</sup> Cardinal Newman however thought the writer "a late one, Monophysite, and much of a neo-Platonist." (Pattison, *Memours*, p. 192.) But without presuming to define too rigidly the results of Scripture-teaching concerning the Angelic Hierarchies, I must express my sympathy with the line of interpretation, that seeks to preserve a fulness of meaning in Scripture, which otherwise it is deprived of ; and that serves to cherish our interest in eternal things. Very different from the tone of Calvin is that Theology, which taught Hooker on his death-bed to meditate on "the number and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order, without which, peace could not be in heaven."<sup>d</sup>

A Hierarchy is defined by Dionysius to be "a sacred order, science, and operation, resembling as far as possible what is divine, and with regard to the illuminations divinely granted to it analogously related to the imitation of God ;" and its end is the contemplation and imitation of God.<sup>e</sup> The principle then of the Hierarchy is the assumed fact of different grades of Divine knowledge and illumination among the blessed Spirits of heaven. And the Scripture passages, which are believed to support this theory, are the following. The sacred episode, which is supposed to represent the Angelic recognition of CHRIST in His Ascension, describes beings who seek and obtain information : "Lift up your heads, O ye gates ; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors ; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory ? The LORD strong and mighty, the LORD mighty in battle."<sup>f</sup> Again, the mysterious dialogue in Isaiah is referred to the gradual knowledge of Angels : "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah ? this that is glorious in His apparel, travelling in the greatness of His strength ? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save."<sup>g</sup> In Daniel, two angels are represented as men

<sup>c</sup> Consule Disputation. Apologeticam, Dionysii Operibus præmissam, auctore Petro Lamselio Gravelingano S. J. Presb.

<sup>d</sup> See Walton's Life of Hooker,

p. 85, Hooker's Works, Ed. Keble.

<sup>e</sup> S. Dionys. De Cœlesti Hierarchia, cap. 3.

<sup>f</sup> Ps. xxiv. 7, 8.

<sup>g</sup> Isa. lxiii. 1.

standing on opposite banks of a river; the one asks, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" the other "held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by Him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half."<sup>h</sup> And in Zechariah we read; "And, behold, the angel that talked with me went forth, and another angel went out to meet him, and said unto him, Run, speak to this young man, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls for the multitude of men and cattle therein."<sup>i</sup>

The first order is that of *Seraphim*, a term signifying the burning intensity of their love to GOD and the ecstatic transports arising from their proximity to Him;<sup>j</sup> therefore Isaiah represents them as covering their face and feet in reverence in the immediate presence of the King of heaven; and as approaching the office of the HOLY SPIRIT in touching his lips with a live coal from off the altar, whereby his iniquity was taken away and his sin purged.<sup>k</sup> The second is that of the *Cherubim*, a term said to imply 'fulness of knowledge' or 'profusion of wisdom,' (*πλήθος γνώσεως ἢ χύσις σοφίας*;) and therefore they are aptly placed "at the east of the garden of Eden,"<sup>l</sup> as guardians of the tree of life, which had been lost to Man by his inordinate participation of the tree of knowledge. And they were set to overshadow the Ark of the Covenant,<sup>m</sup> containing as it did the revelation of the knowledge of God's Will. The third is that of *Thrones*, a term expressive of the steadfast majesty and abiding perpetuity of the Divine indwelling in them. The three next orders of *Dominions*, *Principalities*, and *Powers*, denote different degrees

<sup>h</sup> Dan. xii. 5, 7.

<sup>i</sup> Zech. ii. 3, 4. Grotius derives the use of the terms employed to designate the Hierarchies from the Persian empire under which the Hebrews formerly lived. "Nam ἀρχαὶ sunt רב־רנני (Optimates) Dan. v. 2: δυνάμεις שרין (Principes) Ester. ii. 18: sicut ἐξουσίαι שלטנין (Potestates) a שלטן ἐξουσιάζω (potestatem exerceo) Chaldæis, unde multa sumpserant Persæ. Sic ἀρχαὶ sive ἀρχοντες sunt ראשין (Prin-

cipes) Job xii. 24; xxxix. 25: et apud Ezechielem et Esdram: κυριότητες sive κυρία משרות (Dominationes) Dan. xi. 4, 5. Est autem omnium populorum Orientalium abstracta usurpare pro concretis." Grotius in Ep. ad Romanos, cap 8, v. 38.

<sup>j</sup> τὸ ἐμπροσθὰς ἐμφαίνειν ἢ τὸ θερμαίνοντας. S. Dionys. De Cœl. Hier. c. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Isa. vi. 2, 6, 7.

<sup>l</sup> Gen. iii. 24.

<sup>m</sup> Exod. xxv. 20.



of Angelic agencies in the administration of the Universe ; while *Virtues*, *Archangels*, and *Angels* are connected with the higher ministries attending the revelation of God's Will. In connection with the Hierarchies, ancient writers regarded the creation of Man as intended by God to supply the loss of the fallen Angels, the *broken string* in the ten-stringed instrument of His praise : a notion I find adopted by our heroic visionary, General Gordon. Nor do I doubt that while such souls as the beloved Disciple and S. Francis of Assisi will be found among the Seraphs, S. Paul and S. Augustine be the peers of Cherubs in the Baronage of Heaven, so the soul of that holy soldier and confessor of Christ will be marshalled in the Order for which it is meet. Note Theodoret's words " forming part of the incorporeal choirs," cited below, Chapter XXX., §. 3. Yet Christ implies not the identity of Saints and Angels, but their similarity (S. Matt. xxii. 30).

Of their employments  
and offices.

§. 3. We next inquire into the nature of their employments. Holy Scripture is express on the point, affirming the praise of their Maker to be their chief employment. " They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, LORD GOD ALMIGHTY, which was, and is, and is to come." And the reason is : " Thou art worthy, O LORD, to receive glory and honour and power : for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created." <sup>n</sup> They are as mirrors, in which the Divine love and goodness is faithfully reflected ; rejoicing in God's beneficence in the creation of the world, " when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy ; " <sup>o</sup> and in His recovery of the erring sheep to the One True Fold, for " there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." <sup>p</sup> They are God's vicegerents in the administration of the universe ; a position, which is amply supported by testimonies of Scripture. Jacob journeys to Padan-aram weary and disconsolate ; he dreams, and, behold, earth is no longer divorced from heaven, but " a ladder is set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven : and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it." <sup>q</sup> The Law

<sup>n</sup> Rev. iv. 8, 11.  
<sup>o</sup> Job xxxviii. 7.

<sup>p</sup> S. Luke xv. 10.  
<sup>q</sup> Gen. xxviii. 12.

is given to Moses on Sinai; and in his account of the transaction we read only that "there were thunders and lightnings," and that "mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the LORD descended upon it in fire."<sup>r</sup> But it is enough; to the eye of Faith, it is no longer material fire only, but the train of Him, "Who maketh His angels spirits; and His ministers a flaming fire."<sup>s</sup> And accordingly S. Stephen saith of the Israelites that they "received the law by the disposition of angels,"<sup>t</sup> and S. Paul saith that the law "was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."<sup>u</sup> Manna is miraculously provided for Israel in the wilderness; "And Moses said unto them, This is the bread which the LORD hath given you to eat:"<sup>v</sup> but in the Psalm we learn that "Man did eat angel's food."<sup>w</sup> Barak fought against the Canaanites; but Deborah the Prophetess, discerning more than human agency in their discomfiture, exclaims, "They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera."<sup>x</sup> The servant of Elisha beholds a great host of Syrians compassing Dothan, and his master shut in and apparently defenceless; and is consoled with the assurance, "Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them." And at the Prophet's prayer "the LORD opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha."<sup>y</sup> Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are delivered out of the burning fiery furnace; and Nebuchadnezzar blesses God Who had "sent His angel, and delivered His servants that trusted in Him."<sup>z</sup> When Daniel was saved from the lions, he attributes the miracle to angelic agency, saying, "My God hath sent His angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me."<sup>a</sup> And S. John assigns a supernatural cause for the medicinal qualities of the pool of Bethesda; "For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped

<sup>r</sup> Exod. xix. 16, 18.

<sup>s</sup> Ps. civ. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Acts vii. 53.

<sup>u</sup> Gal. iii. 19.

<sup>v</sup> Exod. xvi. 15.

<sup>w</sup> Ps. lxxviii. 25.

<sup>x</sup> Judges v. 20.

<sup>y</sup> 2 Kings vi. 16, 17.

<sup>z</sup> Dan. iii. 28.

<sup>a</sup> Dan. vi. 22.

in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.”<sup>b</sup> Judging from such instances as these, some of the Ancients did not scruple to assert, that “not without the presidency of invisible husbandmen (so to say) and other stewards not only of the products of earth, but also of all running water and of air, doth the earth bring forth the things said to be dispensed by Nature, and the water gush and stream forth in the wells and perennial rivers, and the air is preserved incorrupt and becomes a nourisher of life to those that breathe it.”<sup>c</sup> It is uncertain however, whether they always meant some spiritual counterparts to these physical virtues or faculties discerned in Nature, or merely personifications of those virtues, as distinct to our apprehension only, and not really separable from the material substances.<sup>d</sup>

Besides, the Angels are regarded as presiding in some mysterious way over the destinies of kingdoms and nations. This notion is universal in Christian antiquity, and was chiefly founded on the verse, “When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the Children of Israel;” but, as it is in the Septuagint, ‘according to the number of the angels of God.’<sup>e</sup> The idea is confirmed by other passages; as, where the Angel Gabriel ‘one like the similitude of the sons of men’ informs Daniel of the conflicts between himself and Michael the tutelar Angel of the Jews on the one hand labouring to promote by their intercessions the Return of Israel from captivity, and the ‘princes’ or tutelar Angels of Persia and Javan on the other, wishing to retain the Jews among the nations committed to their charge, for the promotion of their spiritual interests. “Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy GOD, thy

<sup>b</sup> S. John v. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Origen. Adv. Celsum, Lib. viii. p. 409.

<sup>d</sup> “Declarant nobis, quod minime quæque partes Entium hujus mundi, usque ad creationem membrorum animalium prout sunt, fiant mediantibus Angelis; quia Virtutes

et Facultates omnes sunt Angeli.” Maimonides, More Nevochim, Part. ii. cap. vi. p. 201.

<sup>e</sup> Deut. xxxii. 8. Ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ Ὑψίστος ἔθνη, ὥς διέσκειν υἱὸς Ἀδάμ, ἐστῆσαν ὄρια ἔθνων κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ.

words were heard, and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days : but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me ; and I remained there with the kings of Persia." " Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I came unto thee ? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia : and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come. But I will show thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth : and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince." <sup>f</sup> Again, S. Paul's vision is interpreted of tutelary Angels : " And a vision appeared unto Paul in the night ; There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us." <sup>g</sup> Especially are the Angels set to protect the elect children of GOD on earth temporally and spiritually. " Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation ?" <sup>h</sup> " The Angel of the LORD encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them." " He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways." <sup>i</sup>

The preaching of the Gospel is that of things " which the Angels desire to look into." <sup>j</sup> The development of the Church is for their instruction ; " to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God ;" <sup>k</sup> " for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men." <sup>l</sup> They assist at the universal intercessions of the Church ; as we read, " And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer ; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with

<sup>f</sup> Dan viii. 16 ; x. 12, 13, 20, 21. Calvin writes, " Certe quum Daniel Angelum Persarum et Græcorum Angelum inducit, significat certos Angelos regnis ac provinciis quasi præsidēs destinari." Instt. Lib. i. c. 14. §. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Acts xvi. 9. Grotius interprets this and the former texts of Tutelary Angels. The Fathers do not seem to apprehend any inconvenience from the harmony of this doctrine with Platonic theories : 'Εν

δὲ τοῦτοις ξυμφέρεται μὲν ἡμῖν, ἐν οἷς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς μεταβολὴν ἔφη· καὶ δι, τοῦ Θεοῦ καταλιπόντος τοὺς οὐκας, ἀφίστανται μὲν ὅσοι τῶν ἀοράτων δυναμεῶν οἰκονομεῖν τινὰ μέρη τῆς κτίσεως ἐκελεύσθησαν. Theodoret. Græcarum Affectionum Curatio, Sermon. iv. Opp. Tom. IV. p. 535.

<sup>h</sup> Heb. i. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Ps. xxxiv. 7. xci. 12.

<sup>j</sup> 1 S. Peter i. 12.

<sup>k</sup> Eph. iii. 10.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 9.

the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." <sup>m</sup> But especially at the offering of the perpetual memorial of the Atonement, as we find almost universally in the ancient Liturgies. <sup>n</sup> Nor without reason; seeing that the last "Revelation of JESUS CHRIST, which GOD gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass, He sent and signified it *by His angel* unto His servant John." <sup>o</sup>

Whether a special guardian angel be assigned to each of the Faithful is not evident. That the Jews thought so we may gather from the friends of S. Peter saying "It is his angel," when they were astonished at his miraculous release from prison. Our LORD doth not expressly say so: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of My FATHER which is in heaven." <sup>p</sup>

§. 4. If we inquire whether any obligation of service or worship arises in consequence of the knowledge of their tutelage and intercession, the sentiment of the early Church is expressed by Origen: "Granting according to hypothesis that the knowledge concerning them, being a wonderful and mysterious one, may be comprehended; this knowledge, when it hath set forth their nature and what they have been ordained over, will not allow us to venture to pray to other

Of the  
honour due  
to Angels.

<sup>m</sup> Rev. viii. 3, 4.

<sup>n</sup> For example, in the Alexandrian Liturgy of S. Mark: Τῶν προσφρόντων τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς προσφορὰς τὰ εὐχαριστήρια πρόσδεξαι ὁ Θεός, εἰς τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἐπουράνιον καὶ νοερόν σου θυσιαστήριον εἰς τὰ μεγέθη τῶν οὐρανῶν διὰ τῆς ἀρχαγγελικῆς σου λειτουργίας κ.τ.λ. (Henautot. Liturg. Orient. Tom. I. p. 151.) And in the Canon of the Roman Mass; "Supplices Te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, jube hæc perferri per manus sancti Angeli Tui in sublime altare Tuum, in conspectu Divine Majestatis Tux." (Missale Romanum, p. 311.)

<sup>o</sup> Rev. i. 1.

<sup>p</sup> S. Matt. xviii. 10. The lines of Menander indicate a widely ex-

tended persuasion on this subject: "Ἀπαντὶ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ συμπαρίσταται Εὐθὺς γενομένη, μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου. (Ap. Ammiani Marcellini Hist. Lib. xxi. §. 14.) Limborch remarks; "Nos quidem nullam in sententia illa absurditatem agnoscimus: ex Scriptura tamen probari nequit; immo quoniam Deus aliquando unum Angelum multis præfecit, ut toti populo Israelis, Exod. xxiii. 20: aliquando multos Angelos uni, Gen. xxxii. 1, 2. 2 Reg. vi. 16. Ps. xxxiv. 8, xci. 11, 12. Luc. xvi. 22: hinc rectius colligas, unicuique homini suum a nativitate Angelum assignatum non esse." (Lib. ii. c. 20, §. 20.)

than to the all-sufficient GOD above all, through our SAVIOUR the SON of GOD, Who is WORD and Wisdom and Truth, and as many other things as the Scriptures of the Prophets of GOD and of the Apostles of JESUS say concerning Him. But for the holy Angels of GOD to be propitious to us and that they should do everything for us, our disposition towards GOD is sufficient, copying as far as human nature may their purpose of imitating GOD."<sup>a</sup> And again; "We praise and bless them that have been entrusted by GOD with what is useful to our race: we do not however assign to them the honour due to GOD; for neither doth GOD will this, nor do they themselves who are entrusted with these things."<sup>r</sup> S. Ambrose is the first Christian writer, whom I find distinctly recommending the invocation of Angels.\*

<sup>a</sup> Adv. Celsum, Lib. v. p. 239.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* Lib. viii. p. 428. See also Origen. De Oratione, §. 33, Ed. Oxon. 1686.

\* "Obsecrandi sunt Angeli pro

nobis, qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt; Martyres obsecrandi, etc." (S. Ambros. De Viduis, c. 9, Tom. II. p. 200, Ed. Ben.)

## CHAPTER IX.

## OF SATAN AND THE FALLEN ANGELS.

Of the Fall  
of the Evil  
Angels.

§. 1. WE are not directly told in Scripture when or in what manner some of GOD'S most glorious creatures were perverted from good to evil, from holy obedience to the last degree of rebellion to the Divine Will. The Mosaic record merely implies the recognition of the existence of evil angels by the nation whom it addresses. It speaks of wicked men as 'the children of Belial,'<sup>†</sup> without specifying whom it means by that term; and of "sacrifices unto devils,"<sup>‡</sup> whereby is signified the innocent blood of those whom the Israelites sacrificed "unto the idols of Canaan."<sup>¶</sup> Assuming however the Book of Job to have been known to Moses, if not composed by him, we are thence made acquainted with the existence of a spirit called Satan or 'the adversary,' who is represented as "going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it,"<sup>¶</sup> with the design of effecting evil. Extraordinary evil is attributed to his instigation, as in David's case; "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel."<sup>¶</sup> He is said to resist mankind before GOD as their accuser.<sup>¶</sup> But it is in the New Testament that we are clearly told, that our "adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour;"<sup>¶</sup> that those that know not GOD are "under the power of Satan;"<sup>¶</sup> that "the prince of the power of the air is the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience;"<sup>¶</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Deut. xiii. 13.

<sup>‡</sup> Lev. xvii. 7.

<sup>¶</sup> Ps. cvi. 37, 38.

<sup>¶</sup> Job i. 7.

<sup>¶</sup> 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

<sup>¶</sup> Job ii. 3. Ps. cix. 6. Zech. iii. 1.

<sup>¶</sup> 1 S. Pet. v. 8.

<sup>¶</sup> Acts xxvi. 18.

<sup>¶</sup> Eph. ii. 2.

and that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."<sup>c</sup> When we seek for the meaning of all this, we are obliged to collect the results of several passages of Scripture, and acquiesce in a probable hypothesis. S. Peter supplies the chief text: "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them unto chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."<sup>d</sup> S. Jude explains their sin, namely, that they "kept not their first estate but left their own habitation;" and that the judgment is that of "the great day."<sup>e</sup> Ezekiel is believed to allude to superhuman beings and events, when he blends the following words with others more immediately suited to the condition of the earthly prince of Tyrus; "Thou art the anointing cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee." "Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness."<sup>f</sup> Making allowance for Oriental hyperbole and flights of poetry, it remains that (to render metaphors intelligible) the Prophet must be understood to allude, beyond his present theme, to some narrative, with which his audience were supposed to be familiar. The apposite character of the metaphors employed requires a tolerably close correspondence between the type and antitype. And if in speaking of the 'Cherub' and the 'stones of fire' and the 'garden of God' Ezekiel seems to carry us back to the period of Eden and the Creation, we are justified in assuming, that, like his antitype the prince of Tyre, the 'anointing Cherub' was perfect in his ways till iniquity was found in him; and that his native beauty and brightness was the cause why his heart was lifted up and why he corrupted his wisdom.<sup>g</sup> The first notion of sin or corruption of nature is a swerving of the creature from its sense of dependence on

<sup>c</sup> *1b*. vi. 12.

<sup>d</sup> 2 S. Pet. ii. 4.

<sup>e</sup> S. Jude 6.

<sup>f</sup> Ezek. xxviii. 14, 15, 17.

<sup>g</sup> See Orig. Peri Archon, L. i. c. 5.



its Creator. This, whether it were pride or some form of inordinate desire, was the sin of the Angels, who "kept not their first estate." Their nature was to do GOD's will, inas-much as for His pleasure "they are and were created."<sup>h</sup> One cannot imagine any cause for their swerving, except an acquiescence in their own beauty and wisdom, contrary to their nature which aimed at GOD the Source of all good. This acquiescence contrary to nature involved loss of truth; and therefore in allusion to the seduction of other spirits by the rebellious Archangel, our LORD saith; "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it."<sup>i</sup> Isaiah apostrophises the King of Babylon in language supposed to have reference to a spiritual type; "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit."<sup>j</sup> It would seem almost superfluous to labour to prove that the sin of intellectual and spiritual beings must have been of a similar character; as we find that even in the sin of the first human beings the motive was of an intellectual kind in the first instance; "for GOD doth know," said the tempter, "that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."<sup>k</sup> S. Paul appears to make pride to have been the occasion of the angelic Fall, where he

<sup>h</sup> Rev. iv. 11.

<sup>i</sup> S. John viii. 44.

<sup>j</sup> Isa. xiv. 12—15.—Οὕτω λέγω καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ 'Ιεζεκιήλ ὡς περὶ Φαραὼ ἢ Ναβουχοδονόσορ ἢ Ἀρχοντος Τύρου· ἢ τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ 'Ησαίου, ἐν οἷς θρηνεῖται ὁ βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος· ἀφ' ὧν οὐκ ὀλίγα τὶς ἀν μανθάνει περὶ τῆς κακίας, ποῶν ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν καὶ γένεσιν, καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ

τινῶν πτερορρυσάντων καὶ κατακολου-  
θησάντων τῷ πρώτῳ πτερορρυσάντι·  
ὑπέστη ἡ κακία· οὐ γὰρ οἷον τ' ἦν  
ὁμοίως εἶναι τῷ οὐσιωδῶς ἀγαθῷ ἀγαθὸν  
τὸ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς καὶ ἐξ ἐπιγενήματος  
ἀγαθόν. Origen. Adv. Celsum, L. vi.  
p. 314.

<sup>k</sup> Gen. iii. 5.

saith that a Bishop must be "not a neophyte, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil."<sup>1</sup> Admitting the line of mystical interpretation, as far as we have gone, (and without it many passages of Scripture are unintelligible,) it would follow that Lucifer fell from the highest place of created excellency; for the same title is given to the Logos Himself: "I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."<sup>2</sup> To him it is said retrospectively, "Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty."<sup>3</sup> "The cedars of the garden of God could not hide him; nor any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in his beauty." "To whom art thou thus like in glory and in greatness among the trees of Eden? yet shalt thou be brought down with the trees of Eden unto the nether parts of the earth."<sup>4</sup> Nor was he alone in his fall, for he is called "Beelzebub, the prince of the devils;"<sup>5</sup> and everlasting fire is prepared for "the devil and his angels;"<sup>6</sup> and the Dragon's tail "drew the third part of the stars of heaven," "and his angels were cast out with him."<sup>7</sup>

The consequence of the sin of the angels was their expulsion from the presence of that Truth in Whom they "abode not," in some way analogous to the banishment of Adam and Eve from the 'garden of God.' S. John mystically relates the circumstances of their fall, when he applies the same prophetically to shadow forth what yet shall be, when CHRIST's great work of destroying the works of the devil<sup>8</sup> shall be accomplished. "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world."<sup>9</sup> We are hereby led to connect the apostate Archangel or the Devil and Satan with the Serpent or Dragon which acts in the history of the Fall of our first parents, although not a hint of the connection is afforded

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xxii. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Ezek. xxviii. 12.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* xxxi. 8, 18.

<sup>5</sup> S. Matt. xii. 24.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* xxv. 41.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. xii. 4, 9.

<sup>8</sup> 1 S. John iii. 8.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. xii. 7—9.

by the Mosaic record. The connection of the invisible spirit of evil with the material serpent was not unknown to the Jews; as in the Book of Wisdom: "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own eternity. Nevertheless through envy of the devil came death into the world."<sup>u</sup> And it seems to be sanctioned by our LORD, when He made the miraculous power of treading on serpents conferred on His disciples to be a symbol of their victory over the invisible power of the ghostly enemy and a pledge of the fall of Satan. "And He said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you."<sup>v</sup>

Two theories concerning the Fall of the Angels have been proposed. The one is, that it was in consequence of a revelation of the future Hypostatic Union of the LOGOS with humanity, and the obligation of worship thence accruing to His assumed humanity. It is founded on the verse; "And again, when He bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the Angels of God worship Him."<sup>w</sup> If it be true, it assumes that the LOGOS as *Incarnate* is the cause of salvation and beatitude to Angels; when the Creed only saith that "for us men and for our salvation He came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the HOLY GHOST of the Virgin Mary."<sup>x</sup>

The other theory regards the Fall in connection with the Mosaic account of the 'sons of God' taking unto themselves wives of the 'daughters of men.'<sup>y</sup> Quite a *consensus* of early Fathers is in favour of this strange legend; which would go

<sup>u</sup> Wisd. ii. 23, 34. Maimonides writes; "Sic itaque apparet quod Sammaël sit ipse Satan, et quod per illud nomen certi et occulti aliquid significetur, sicut per nomen *Nachasch*, h. e. Serpens. Dicunt etiam; Cum veniret (Serpens) ad decipiendam Evam, fuit Sammaël equitans super illum, et Deus irridebat camelum et sessorem ejus." More Nevochim, Part. ii. cap. 30.

<sup>v</sup> S. Luke x. 18, 19.

<sup>w</sup> Heb. i. 6.

<sup>x</sup> See Estius, In Sent. Lib. ii. Dist. 6. §. 7. The notion was adopted by Mohammed, who represents God as saying; "And when we said unto the angels, Worship Adam; they all worshipped him, except Eblis, who refused, and was puffed up with pride, and became of the number of unbelievers." Sale's Koran, chap. 2. Cf. chap. 7, and 15.

<sup>y</sup> Gen. vi. 2.

far to destroy the theory already advanced concerning the spiritual agent in the Fall of Man, unless it be understood of a defection of angels posterior to that of Lucifer and his angels. They were supposed to have betrayed the secrets of Nature, and to have taught the women they loved the rudiments of arts and sciences, the wonders of astronomy and the virtues of herbs and incantations. But it needs not that more be said to remove the notion from immaterial and pure beings, such as evil angels were before they fell.\* That is to say, such a material temptation could not have assailed angels in "their first estate," wherein God created them. But if we suppose, analogously to the Fall of Man, that there were *degrees* of guilt in the transgression of angels, and that the seduced were not precipitated to the dungeon of their seducers, I see no bar to our supposing the former liable to a further fall. And the account given in the Book of Enoch deserves consideration, if only because it expresses Eastern tradition; as does the Persian notion of the *Peris*, a partly beneficent order of fallen spirits. (See my *Sanctorale Catholicum*, article 'Enoch,' and Lord Byron's *Cuin*.)

§. 2. What hath been above said respecting the hierarchies and employments of the Blessed Angels may be in some measure applied to the case of the Fallen Angels; but with this distinction, that "in Holy Scripture the names of some orders, as of Seraphim and Thrones, are not attributed to devils, because these names are taken from the ardour of charity and the indwelling of God, which cannot be with mortal sin. But the names of Cherubim, Principalities, and Powers are attributed to them, because these names are borrowed from knowledge and power, which may be in common

Of the power  
of the Evil  
Angels, and  
of the nature  
of devilish  
temptations.

\* See S. Justin Martyr, (in *Apologetica* I. p. 44;) S. Irenæus, (*Adv. Hæreses*, Lib. iv. c. 30;) S. Clemens Alex., (*Pædagogus*, Lib. ii. c. 2, and *Stromat.* Lib. v. p. 401;) Athenagoras, (pp. 27, 28, *ad calcem* S. Justin Opp.) Tertullian, (*De Cultu Fœminarum*, c. 2;) S. Cyprian, (*De Habitu Virginum*, p. 99;) Syn-cellus, (*Chronographia*, pp. 10—13;) Cedrenus, (*Synopsis Historiarum*, p. 10.) The last, a Byzantine writer, endeavours to reconcile the narrative

with probability by rationalising, and making the *Egregori* or sons of God to signify the descendants of Seth and not the Angels. The majority of later Commentators have followed S. Chrysostom, S. Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and S. Augustine, in rejecting a notion derived from the fabulous Book of Enoch. See S. Augustin. *De Civitate Dei*, L. xv. c. 23, Tom. VII. p. 408.

to good and evil beings.”<sup>a</sup> Satan is called the ‘prince of this world,’<sup>b</sup> the ‘god of this world,’<sup>c</sup> the ‘prince of the power of the air;’<sup>d</sup> and his angels, the ‘rulers of the darkness of this world.’<sup>e</sup> As the material universe is revealed to us as being under the disposition of good angels, so for the trial or punishment of man evil angels are also permitted by GOD to control the agencies of Nature and insinuate evil into the imaginations of men. For example, we read only in Exodus that “the LORD sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along upon the ground;”<sup>f</sup> but in the Psalm we are told, “He gave up their cattle also to the hail, and their flocks to hot thunderbolts. He cast upon them the fierceness of His anger, wrath, and indignation, and trouble, by sending evil angels among them.”<sup>g</sup> Another Psalm speaks of ‘the destruction that wasteth at noonday,’ alluding to the fatal effects of a *coup du soleil* under a Syrian sky;<sup>h</sup> but in the reading of the Septuagint it is ‘the demon of noontide,’ (*ἀπὸ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ*.) Saul is afflicted with hypochondria; and we are told that “the SPIRIT of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him:”<sup>i</sup> and, to leave no room for doubting the objective and external reality of the possession, our LORD cast out devils from a man, and at the same time gave them leave to enter into a herd of swine to cause their destruction.<sup>j</sup> The power of devils in suggesting evil in the minds of men is proved by what is said of Judas, how “the devil put into his heart to betray” JESUS.<sup>k</sup> But this is not said without our being previously apprized of the sins, whereby Judas had rendered himself obnoxious to the power of Satan: “This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.”<sup>l</sup>

Origen well expounds the manner of devilish temptations. “The reason then is evident,” he says; “for, as in things the human purpose alone by itself is imperfect towards the

<sup>a</sup> S. Tho. Summ. I. qu. 63, art. 9.

<sup>b</sup> S. Jo. xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 4.

<sup>d</sup> Eph. ii. 2.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* vi. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Ex. ix. 23.

<sup>g</sup> Ps. lxxviii. 48, 49.

<sup>h</sup> Ps. xci. 6. See Grotius in *loc.*

<sup>i</sup> 1 Sam. xvi. 14.

<sup>j</sup> S. Mark v. 13.

<sup>k</sup> S. John xiii. 2.

<sup>l</sup> *Ibid.* xii. 6.

consummation of good, for by the Divine aid is every thing brought to perfection : so also in contrary things we receive certain beginnings and as it were some seeds of sins from those things which we have naturally in use. But when we have indulged more than is enough, and have not made a stand against the first motions of intemperance, then the hostile influence taking the place of this first transgression instigates and over-urges us, by all means studying to enlarge sins more profusely ; we men indeed supplying the occasions and beginnings of sins, but the adverse powers propagating them more widely and further, if it may be, without any end. We are not however to suppose that aught else befalls us from the good or evil thoughts themselves which are suggested to our hearts, except a commotion only and incitement provoking us to good or to evil. For, when the malignant influence begins to incite us to evil, it is possible for us to cast away from us bad suggestions, and resist the worst persuasions, and altogether do nothing blameably."<sup>m</sup> Therefore is it written, "Keep thy heart with all diligence ; for out of it are the issues of life ;"<sup>n</sup> and "Be ye angry, and sin not : neither give place to the devil ;"<sup>o</sup> "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us : for we are not ignorant of his devices."<sup>p</sup>

§. 3. An obscure sect in the ancient Assyria, the Yezidees, whose tenets are a singular graft of Manichæism and Mahometanism on the old Persian stock, confound Ahriman the Evil Principle with Satan, worship him as 'the Lord of the Evening,' and believe in his ultimate restoration to heaven. I doubt not but the belief in the eternity of Matter has influenced them and others, and the identification with Satan was an after-thought. But let those who lean to the tenet of universal restoration of the lost reflect, that the Yezidee belief is the logical issue of their thought, which Origen also scrupled not to conclude. If it be admitted, why not also the contingency of another Fall ? But such dreams are precluded by the dogma of a universal judgment of men and angels. Sir Walter Scott has luminously touched the subject in the *Talisman*, chap. iii.

Of their  
restoration.

<sup>m</sup> Peri Archon, Lib. iii. cap. 2.  
<sup>n</sup> Prov. iv. 23.

<sup>o</sup> Eph. iv. 26, 27.  
<sup>p</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 11.

## CHAPTER X.

## OF THE CREATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

Of the Creation of the world, and of the six days.

§. 1. FROM the consideration of things invisible, whereof GOD is the Maker, we now come to the visible. It has been observed by Maimonides, that, "to believe that the world is ancient in the manner set forth by Aristotle, namely, that it is of necessity, that nothing in Nature is changed, that nothing exorbitates outside its custom, (such a position) utterly overturns the Law, arraigns all signs and miracles of falsehood, and also takes away everything which the Law bids us to hope or GOD to fear."<sup>¶</sup> He is more indulgent to the theory of Plato, that the heavens are capable of birth and decay; and anticipates little or no injury therefrom to the cause of Revelation. We may hence see the reason for the emphatic assertion of S. Paul, "*Through faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the WORD of GOD, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."<sup>¶</sup> "In the beginning GOD created the heaven and the earth."<sup>¶</sup> "But to me considering the senses (supplied by) many," says John Scotus Erigena, "nothing occurs more probable, nothing more like the truth, than that in the afore-said words of Holy Scripture, in the signification namely of heaven and earth, we should understand the primordial causes of the entire creation, which before all things which were created the FATHER had created in His Only-Begotten SON, Who is named by the appellation of 'the Beginning;' and that by the name of 'Heaven' we should understand the principal causes of intelligible things and of heavenly essences to

¶ More Nevochim, Part. II. c. 25.

¶ Gen. i. 1.

¶ Heb. xi. 3.

be signified, but by that of 'Earth' those of sensible things, wherewith the universe is filled." \* If then the FATHER creates all things in the Beginning by His WORD, Who is the Beginning of His Processions, we are to expect the perfecting operation of the HOLY GHOST to follow. As Life is the exponent of the working of the SON, † so is Motion that of the SPIRIT. And so we read, "And the SPIRIT of GOD moved upon the face of the waters." ‡ "But if, as a certain Syrian is said to have translated it, (who, as S. Basil says, so far retired from worldly wisdom as he approached the doctrine of truth), it be so read, 'And the SPIRIT of GOD cherished the waters,' the meaning will occur more easily. § For the HOLY GHOST cherished the primordial causes, which the FATHER had made in the Beginning, that is, in His SON, in order that they might proceed to those things which they cause; that is, He nourished them with the brooding of Divine love; for to this end are eggs brooded on by birds (from whom this metaphor is taken,) that the intimate and invisible power, which lies hid in them, may at distinct places and times burst forth into visible forms and corporal beauties through the operation of fire and air in the humours of seeds and earthly matter." ¶ I may remark that if we refer the direct action of GOD in Creation to the production of what Erigena here calls 'the primordial causes' or seminal originations of things, leaving their development to the ministries of inferior Powers, we exalt rather than impair our conceptions of His greatness. Plato in the *Timæus* attributes the creation to the agency of inferior Gods; Augustine, who probably never read the Greek text, says he erred. (*Opp.* Tom. viii. col. 941.) Yet S. Paul saith the Law was given or 'ordained' and 'spoken by angels.' (Gal. iii. 19. Heb. ii. 2.) This notion must be carefully distinguished from the Gnostic creation by *Æons*. I mean that the Supreme may employ the ministry of angels in developing the seeds which spring from His *Fiat* or decree.

\* De Divisione Naturæ, Lib. ii. §. 15, p. 56.

† Prov. viii. 22.

‡ S. John i. 4.

§ Gen. i. 2. I entirely reject the interpretation which here under-

stands 'a mighty wind,' as inferior to the dignity of the subject.

¶ *Συνέβαλε καὶ ἐξωργόνει τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν.* S. Basil. in Hexaëmeron, Homil. ii. *Opp.* Tom. I. p. 24.

‡ Erigena, Lib. ii. §. 19, p. 60.



Nor must I fail to notice the remarkable correspondence of Aristophanes's account of the Creation with that of Moses "Earth was not, nor air, nor sky; but in the infinite bosom of Darkness black-winged Night produces first of all an egg, whence as the hours sped on sprang Eros (*Love*) the desirable, his back resplendent with golden wings, like the rapid gusts of wind. He brooded over Chaos . . . but the race of immortals was not, till Love commingled all things." (*Birds*, 694-700.)

In order to accommodate his narrative to the capacity of the Hebrew people Moses describes the process of creation as going on during six days, and its effects reviewed and approved of by the Creator on the seventh; which was therefore called the Sabbath or Rest of God, because "on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made."\*

To understand the six days literally to mean *days*, according to our present experience, seems to be attended with great difficulties; because the existing relations of the planetary system obviously were not in being on the first three 'days,' according to the Mosaic account; and yet our notion of days involves the existence of those relations. S. Augustine, indeed, perceiving the difficulty, attempts a fanciful theory of distinct modes of perception, whereby angelic beings might become cognizant of God's work in Creation. "Since the knowledge of the creature in a manner draws towards evening in comparison of the knowledge of the Creator, and also lightens and becomes morning, when it relates to the praise and love of the Creator; nor doth it verge on night, where the Creator is not forsaken of the creature's love."\* But, besides that not a hint is given us by Moses that he wrote his history with a tacit reference to angelic experiences, where do we find any thing in Holy Scripture to justify us in assuming, that the intelligence of the Blessed Angels can at any moment be otherwise than illuminated with the full radiance of the Presence of God? With reason then we may acquiesce in the utter impossibility of a solution. For the world was not made in time, but simultaneously with time. "For that which is made in time is both made before

\* Gen. ii. 2.

xi. c. 7. Tom. VII. p. 277.

\* S. Aug. De Civitate Dei, Lib.

and after some time ; after that which is past, before that which is future : but there could be no past, because there was no creature by whose mutable motions it might be actuated. But the world was made with time, if in its composition mutable motion was made ; as also that order of the first six or seven days seems to stand, wherein morning and evening are named, until all things which GOD made on those days are accomplished on the sixth day, and the resting of GOD is commended on the seventh in a great mystery. Which days of what kind they be, is either very difficult or even impossible for us to think, how much more to say.”<sup>b</sup> On the question of innumerable worlds in the starry system, as held by Democritus, Augustine admits that it and some others did not seem to him to deserve being called heresies. (*De Hæresib.* 77. 80.) See below, ch. xix. §. 4. Bishop Bull treats ‘an infinity of worlds’ as a paradox of Origen’s. (*Defens. Fid. Nicæn.* II. c. ix. §. 22.)

§. 2. When GOD had created the world, it is written, that He “saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good.”<sup>c</sup> “But good is found in things, not only as far as relates to their substance, but also to the order thereof towards their ultimate end, which is the Divine goodness ;” for it is for GOD’s pleasure they are and were created.<sup>d</sup> “This good of order then existing in created things is created by GOD. But when GOD is the cause of things through His intellect, and so the reason of every effect thereof must needs pre-exist in it, the reason of the order of things towards their end must needs pre-exist in the Divine Mind. But such reason is properly Providence.”<sup>e</sup> Therefore, He Who “made the worlds” is described by S. Paul as “upholding all things by the word of His power.” “Some totally denied Providence, as Democritus and the Epicureans, laying it down that the

Of Providence.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* c. 6. p. 276. Maimonides says to the same purport : “Mundus non creatus est in Principio Temporalis (*temporis*), sicuti declaravimus ; Tempus enim est ex numero creaturarum. Ideo dicitur, *Bereshith*, creavit Deus ; ubi Præpositio inseparabilis ꝑ *Beth* est *Beth vasis* seu *Instrumenti* : et vera

illius loci expositio est hæc : *In principio creavit Deus superiora et inferiora* : Expositio conveniens novitati mundi.” More Nevochim, Lib. ii. c. 30. p. 275.

<sup>c</sup> Gen. i. 31.

<sup>d</sup> Rev. iv. 11.

<sup>e</sup> S. Thom. Summ. I. qu. 22. art. 1.

world was made by chance. Others determined, that incorruptible things only were subject to Providence, but corruptible things not according to individuals but according to kinds, for so they are incorruptible; in whose character it is said in Job: 'And thou sayest, How doth God know? how can He judge through the dark cloud? Thick clouds are a covering to Him, that He seeth not: and He walketh in the circuit of heaven.'<sup>f</sup> But from the generality of things corruptible Rabbi Moses excepted men because of the splendour of the intellect, in which they participate. Yet in the case of other corruptible individuals, he followed the opinion of others.<sup>g</sup> But we must needs say that all things are subject to Divine Providence, not only in general, but also in particular. Which is thus evident. For when every agent acts for an end, the ordering of effects towards it reaches so far only as the causality of the first agent doth reach. For hence it happens in the works of any agent that something not ordained to the end comes to pass, because that effect follows from some other cause besides the intention of the agent. But the causality of God, Who is the First Agent, reaches all beings, not only the principles of a species but also individual principles, not only of incorruptible things but also of corruptible. Whence it must needs be that all things which in any way exist are ordained of God towards an end, according to the Apostle, 'The powers that

<sup>f</sup> Job xxii. 13, 14.

<sup>g</sup> It is thus that he states his belief: "Credo itaque Providentiam Divinam in mundo hoc inferiori seu sublunari esse tantum in individujs speciei humanæ; et hanc speciem solam esse, cujus individuorum negotia omniaque sive bona sive mala quæ eis accidunt secundum judicium et justitiam administrantur, sicut dicitur: Omnes viæ Ejus judicium." (Deut. xxxii. 4.) Reliqua vero animalia, plantas, et alia quod attinet, de illis amplector sententiam Aristotelis; minimeque credo, folium illud quod ex arbore decedit singulari Dei Providentia cadere; vel singulari Dei decreto muscam capi ab aranea; vel a sputo quod Ruben exspuit muscam super quam

in hoc vel illo loco cadit ex decreto Dei interfici; vel piscem speciali voluntate Dei vermiculum natantem in superficie aquarum capere et deglutire: sed ista omnia meo calculo fiunt per accidens, sicut opinatus est Aristoteles. Providentia autem Divina, ut ego quidem sentio et prout mihi videtur, sequitur Influentiam Divinam; et speciei illi, cui Influentia illa intellectualis adhæret, ita ut intellectu prædita fiat et ei reveletur quicquid intellectum habenti revelatum est; speciei, inquam, illi conjuncta est Providentia Divina, omnesque illius actiones secundum præmium vel poenam mensurantur." More Nevochim, Part. iii. cap. 17. p. 382.

be are ordained of GOD.<sup>b</sup> When therefore the Providence of GOD is nothing else than the reason of the order of things towards an end, it is necessary that all things, as far as they participate in being, should so far be subject to Divine Providence."<sup>1</sup>

Against this view of Providence, the following passages of Scripture are objected; "Thou makest men as the fishes of the sea, as the creeping things, that have no ruler over them;"<sup>j</sup> and, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth GOD take care for oxen?"<sup>k</sup> To these it is sufficient to cite our LORD's words in reply: "Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and GOD feedeth them."<sup>l</sup> But it may be further noticed that a distinction arises from the fact, that "the rational creature, because it hath dominion over its own act through free will, is in a certain special manner subject to Divine Providence, so that to wit something is imputed to it for blame or for merit, and something rendered to it as punishment or reward. And in view of this, the Apostle removes the care of GOD from oxen; not, however, meaning that individual irrational creatures pertain not to the providence of GOD, as Rabbi Moses thought.<sup>m</sup> It is enough to notice how GOD includes 'much cattle,' that is, their welfare, in His reasons for sparing Nineveh. (Jonah iv. 11. Leibniz, *Théodicée*, II. §. 116.)

Again, it is objected: "He Himself made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his counsel;"<sup>n</sup> and, "So I gave them up unto their own hearts' lust; and they walked in their own counsels."<sup>o</sup> "In that it is said, that GOD left man to himself, man is not excluded from Divine Providence: but it is shown, that an operative virtue determined to a single object is not prescribed to him as to natural things, which act only as if directed to their end by another,

<sup>b</sup> Rom. xiii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> S. Tho. *ubi supra*, art. 2. Damascene defines Providence as βούλησις Θεοῦ δι' ἣν πάντα τὰ ὄντα τὴν πρόσφορον διεξαγωγὴν λαμβάνει. De Orth. Fide, cap. 46.

<sup>j</sup> Habakkuk i. 14.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 9.

<sup>l</sup> S. Luke xii. 24.

<sup>m</sup> S. Tho. *ubi supra*.

<sup>n</sup> Eccles. xv. 14.

<sup>o</sup> Ps. lxxxi. 12. Compare Acts vii. 42. Rom. i. 24. Eph. iv. 18, 19.

but do not themselves act as directing themselves to their end, as rational creatures do by means of free will, whereby they deliberate and choose: whence He significantly saith 'in the hand of his counsel.' But because the act itself of free will is reduced to GOD, as its cause; it must needs be, that those things which come to pass in consequence of free will are subject to Divine Providence. For the providence of man is contained under the Providence of GOD, as a particular cause under a universal. But GOD hath a providence over righteous men in a more excellent manner than over the ungodly; in so far as He permits nothing to come to pass against them, which may finally hinder their salvation. 'For all things work together for good to them that love GOD.'<sup>p</sup> But from this very circumstance, that He doth not draw back the ungodly from the evil of guilt, He is said to leave them to themselves; not however so, that they are totally excluded from His providence; otherwise they would fall into nothing unless they were preserved through His Providence."<sup>q</sup>

Of Fate.

§. 3. "Divine Providence executes its effects by means of intermediate causes. The ordering thereof may be considered in two ways. First, according as it is in GOD Himself; and so the ordering itself of effects is called Providence. But according as it is considered in intermediate causes ordained by GOD for producing some effects, in that way it is accounted Fate. And this is what Boethius saith,<sup>r</sup> 'Whether Fate is exercised by certain spirits attending on Divine Providence, or by the soul, or by entire Nature serving thereto, or by the celestial motions of the stars, or by angelic virtue, or by the various crafts of demons, or by any or all of them, the fatal chain is woven.'"<sup>s</sup> Durandus notices the ancient acceptation of Fate as "an influence of the stars imposing a necessity on what is done by free will;" in which sense Christians deny the existence of Fate. Thus the Pharisees thought that certain aptitudes to Virtue and the contrary proceeded from the planets ascendant at a man's birth; and we are told by S. James that every good gift comes from GOD, the Maker of the lights of

<sup>p</sup> Rom. viii. 28.

<sup>q</sup> S. Tho. *ubi supra*.

<sup>r</sup> De Consolatione, L. iv. *Prosa* 4.

<sup>s</sup> S. Tho. Summ. i. qu. 116, art. 2.

heaven, Who knows no *parallax* nor *tropical revolutions*. (Bull, *Harmon. Apost.* II. c. 15.) But otherwise it is called "the order of causes and their connection as they are reduced to the Divine Will and knowledge ordering and connecting all things." Or, as Aquinas has it, "Fate is the ordering of second causes to effects divinely provided." In the two last definitions of Fate, "it is evident that it differs in many respects from Providence. For Providence is in God, but Fate in second causes; for it is the order of causes reduced to God. Secondly, Fate depends on Providence, and is reduced to it, and not conversely. Thirdly, Providence is eternal, but Fate temporal; for that which God hath disposed and provided from eternity, He temporally administers by Fate. Fourthly, all things are not subject to Fate, as those which immediately proceed from God without the order of second causes: "as the creation of things, the glorification of spiritual substances, and others of this kind; " "and generally as far as any things are nearer to God, so much the less are they subject to Fate, but all things are subject to Divine Providence." "

§. 4. Two principal objections occur to what has already been advanced. The first is derived from those deviations from the common course and constitution of Nature called Miracles, which are alleged in Scripture to have taken place at certain periods. The second is borrowed from the existence of imperfection and evil in Nature, apparently contradictory of the inspired Record, which states that "God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." "

Objection  
from Mira-  
cles.

It may be assumed in the first place as a maxim, that "we should never have recourse to a miracle, where the truth may be preserved with the natural course of things." Maimonides says of Miracles, that "nothing in the world changes from its nature with a constant and permanent mutation. For although the rod (of Moses) was changed into a serpent, the water into blood, a clean hand into one white (with leprosy),

\* Durand. in Sent. Lib. i. Dist. 39, qu. 4.

" S. Tho. *ubi supra*, art. 4.

" S. Tho. *ubi supra*.

" Durand. *ubi supra*.

" Gen. i. 31.

" Durand. Lib. ii. Dist. 17, qu. 3,

§. 11.

without any necessary natural cause; yet all those things did not remain so constantly, nor were changed into another nature." This statement reduces miracles to an illusion, not discernible from the wonders performed by Hindoo jugglers. "But, as our Rabbins say, The world retains and follows its custom. And this is our sentiment concerning miracles, which we deem should be believed and embraced; although our wise men have put forth far different sentiments concerning them, which you will find written in *Bereschith Rabbah* and *Medrasch Koheleth*. For they think that miracles also in some way proceed from Nature. They say, when GOD created this universe, He then ordained and determined to each being its own nature, and implanted in those natures a power of producing those miracles, which should befall in them in their own season; and that the Sign of a Prophet is nothing else than that GOD may have signified to the Prophets the time wherein they should say this or that, and wherein this or that thing was to have some miraculous effect, which He had implanted in its nature from the beginning." Here we have suggested 'a general law' of miracles; namely, "that they spring forth as it were at their own time from hidden causes which were established at the creation" (Bull, *Harmon. Apost.* II. c. 15. §. 14.); "as if, for example, GOD put it in the nature of water, that it be continuous and ever flow downwards; that time only excepted when the Egyptians were drowned in it, and that water only which was divided."\* "But if," as Origen observes, "we say that the things that take place according to the word of GOD and His will are necessarily in the very mention of them not beside or contrary to Nature, the things that are done by GOD are not beside Nature, though they be contrary to expectation (*παράδοξα*) or seem to some to be so. But if we must name (Nature) in a constrained manner, we will say that in respect of the more general conception of Nature, there are some things above nature, which GOD may do some time or other, elevating man above human nature, and causing him to change to a better and diviner nature."\*

\* More Nevochim, Part. ii. cap. 29, p. 271.

\* Adv. Celsum, Lib. iv. p. 253.

Limborch justly animadverts on the dangerous tenets of Francis Burmann, a Professor of Divinity at Utrecht, on this subject; who, following in the footsteps of Benedetto di Spinosa, and adopting his very words, writes, "If men clearly understood the entire order of Nature, they would find all things equally necessary as Mathematical propositions; but because we do not penetrate thus far, therefore some things are judged by us possible or indifferent, but not necessary."<sup>b</sup> Not content with this, he says of miracles; "GOD worketh by His ordinary power according to the laws of Nature known to us, but by His extraordinary power according to those not known to us." "Which if it were true," remarks Limborch, "a Miracle is not a work surpassing the powers of Nature and evincing the supreme government of GOD over all things, but is only esteemed such by our error, who are ignorant of the laws of Nature; but it really comes to pass according to laws once for all implanted in Nature. Which is the very impiety of Spinosa."<sup>c</sup>

But as this argument of Spinosa seems at first sight not unlike Bishop Butler's hint about GOD's miraculous interpositions having been by general laws, it may be worth while to examine the latter briefly. Butler argues, that as "it is from our finding, that the course of Nature, in some respects and so far, goes on by general laws," (*so far as we can trace it*), "that we conclude this of the rest" of the universe, *where we are unable to trace it*; so "it is a just ground also" "to apprehend," "that GOD's miraculous interpositions may have been, all along in like manner, by *general* laws of wisdom." It is true, that Butler does not say that it is a just ground 'to conclude' the last postulate, but only 'to apprehend, to render it supposable and credible;' 'which is sufficient,' he adds, 'for answering objections.' Yet he goes on to compare these 'general laws of miraculous interpositions,' as he terms them, with the mysteries of Nature, "the laws from whence it is, that some die as soon as they are born, and others live to extreme old age; that one

<sup>b</sup> In *synopsi Theologiæ*, lib. i. cap. 25, *De Omnipotentia Dei*, §. 10. Spinosa, in *Cogitatis Metaphysicis*, c. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. ii. cap. xv. §§. 8, 9.



man is so superior to another in understanding ; with innumerable more things, which we cannot reduce to any laws or rules at all, though it is taken for granted they are as much reducible to general ones as gravitation." From this assumption, that "the revealed dispensations of Providence and miraculous interpositions" are "by general laws, as well as God's ordinary government in the course of nature, made known by reason and experience ;" he draws the conclusion, that "there is no more reason to expect, that every exigence, as it arises, should be provided for by these general laws of miraculous interpositions, than that every exigence in nature should, by the general laws of nature."<sup>d</sup> Without granting Bishop Bull that Maimonides, and by implication Bishop Butler, were *insane*, I think it better to class Miracles 'with' those 'innumerable things, which' (as Butler himself acknowledges) 'we cannot reduce to any laws or rules at all ;' and not to take it for granted, that 'they are as much reducible to general ones as gravitation.' For, in our very conception of them, they appear to be extraordinary methods provided by God to supply exigencies, which the general laws of Nature fail to meet under particular circumstances ; as when God 'rained down manna' on the camp of Israel, when 'they tempted' Him, saying, "Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?"<sup>e</sup> or they are interruptions of the general laws of Nature, as when God "made the waters" of the Red Sea "to stand as an heap ;"<sup>f</sup> which allow not of the application to them of any such notion as that of 'general laws.' Yet do they not derogate from the general laws of Nature ; but proceed from reasons of an order above that of Nature, and must be regarded as God's application of those superior reasons. (Leibniz, *Théodicée*, Pt. II. §. 207.) To sum up again in the words of Maimonides : "This world is perpetual in that nature, which God hath given to it according to His good pleasure ; nor is anything changed therein, unless miraculously in some particular things ; although God hath the power and faculty of changing or depriving it entirely or any parts thereof."<sup>g</sup>

<sup>d</sup> Butler's Analogy, Part ii. chap. iv. pp. 228, 9.

<sup>e</sup> Ps. lxxviii. 19.

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid.* verse 13.

<sup>g</sup> More Nevochim, *ubi supra*. I need scarcely say, that I adopt the

§. 5. The other great objection to the Scripture account of the Creation is the fact of Evil intermingled with Good throughout the world, not only in its physical structure, but also in the moral nature of its inhabitants. Unable and unwilling to resist the manifold proofs of the goodness of the Creator, yet at the same time refusing to shut their eyes to the appalling fact of co-existent Evil, the ancient Magians endeavoured to account for the apparent contradiction by asserting two co-ordinate Principles, the one of Good, the other of Evil, Ormuzd and Ahriman. Another attempt to explain the difficulty, by the heretic Valentinus at Alexandria, took the form of asserting, that "Matter was without order, without form; that GOD converted the better portions thereof; but the feculent parts, that were useless for the purposes of creation, these He left aside, being in no wise suitable to Him: whence (they thought) proceeded the seeds of Evil."<sup>h</sup> He must have felt the opposition of physical Good and Evil deeply inwoven in the web of Creation, when he imagined the rude elements to express the 'divine despair,' the briny sea the tears of the imperfect *Æon* Achamoth (the natural Wisdom), the sunny light her smile, when she caught a glimpse of Heaven and lost it. Origen, in one place seems partly to admit the notion; for he borrows an analogy from mechanical operations on earth to illustrate the working of the Almighty Artificer. "Evils then," he says, "if one would understand those that are absolutely so called, God made not; but, being few as compared with the constitution of the universe, they followed His primary works, as shavings and saw-dust follow the primary works of a carpenter."<sup>i</sup> But it is difficult to accept such an illustration, lest we should be led into the heresy of acknowledging the co-eternity of Matter. Nor doth it attempt more than a solution of physical evil or

Objection from the existence of Evil: of its origin.

application of the word 'perpetual' to the world, not as denying the changes it may undergo at "the coming of the day of GOD, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat" (2 S. Pet. iii. 12); but in accordance with David who saith, "Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it

should not be removed for ever" (Ps. civ. 5); and Solomon, "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: but the earth abideth for ever." (Eccles. i. 4.)

<sup>h</sup> Origen. Contra Marcionitas, §. iv. p. 98.

<sup>i</sup> Adv Celsum, L. vi. p. 323.

imperfection; without helping us to discover the origin of immaterial or spiritual Evil. More wisely then doth Origen say elsewhere; "Evils are not according to nature or essence or substance, but by a *change come to pass from free will*."<sup>j</sup> "We say then," says Damascene, "that Evil is nothing else but a *privation of good* and a transgression from that which is according to nature to that which is contrary to nature. For nothing is evil according to nature, but subservient and subject to the Creator. When therefore any creature willingly rebels and becomes disobedient to its Maker, it hath established evil in itself. For evil is not essence, nor a property of essence, but an accident; or a willing perversion from what is according to nature to what is beside it, which is sin."<sup>k</sup> If then Evil proceeds from the 'privation of good' and 'a change arising from free will,' it follows that it exists contingently in the region of eternal Truths, that is to say, in the thoughts or object-matter of the Divine Intellect, in the ideal reasons which limit and circumscribe the creature at the outset of his being; for God could not give him His own Divinity, with its perfections. That were not Creation, but the Filiation of a Divine Personality. (Leibniz, *Théodicée*, Pt. I.)

I am disposed however to admit, from the general language of Scripture, that in the case of Man the co-partnership of matter with spirit aided in the genesis of Evil, and even rendered him a fitter object of the Divine compassion. It is certain that Augustine wrote in ignorance of the existence of monstrous and noxious animals before the appearance of Man upon the earth: so that I am dissatisfied with his off-hand language to the Pelagian, "*Neque enim, si nemo peccasset, fœda atque monstrosa etiam in Paradiso corpora nascerentur*." (*Contra Julian*. I. *Opp.* Tom. VIII. fol. 941.) It is stated that John Stuart Mill would have regarded Christianity with more favour, had it been more Manichæan, that is, had it allowed Evil a position nearly equal to that of Good

<sup>j</sup> *Contra Marcionitas, ubi supra*, p. 160.

<sup>k</sup> *De Orthod. Fide*, cap. 97. See also cap. 19. S. Augustine also

says, "*Neque enim ulla natura mali est, sed amissio boni hoc nomen accepit*." *De Genesi ad litteram*, Lib. viii. §. 31. Tom. III. p. 236.

in the government of the universe. (*The Unseen Universe*, p. 35.)

But having got thus far, namely, to separate the causality of Evil from God, we have but advanced a step. For the difficulty still remains: why did God, being essentially good, permit evil to enter into His Creation? Now, although it is hopeless to solve so primary a mystery, it is not useless to seek reasons to calm the human intellect, and persuade it to acquiesce in the ignorance which its Maker has thought right to impose. It was thus then that the rationalising Theodore of Mopsuestia endeavoured to account for the Divine permission of Evil. "God did not bring death upon man without His own accord and beside His judgment, nor gave He entrance to sin to no purpose; for had He not chosen that this should be, He lacked not power to prevent it. But because He knew it to be useful to us or rather to all rational creatures, that first there should be an entrance of evils and of what is worse, but that afterwards these should be destroyed and better things be introduced; therefore God divided the creation into two states, the present and future, in the latter indeed intending to lead all to immortality and immutability, but in the present creation meanwhile letting us fall into death and mutability. For if indeed He had made us immediately from the beginning immortal and immutable, we should not have differed from irrational creatures, not knowing our proper good. For had we known no change, we should not have known the good of immutability; not knowing death, we should not have known the gain of immortality; being ignorant of corruption, we should not have praised incorruption; not knowing the burden of sufferings, we should not have admired impassibility. In short, had we no experience of evils, we could not have gained the knowledge of those good things."<sup>1</sup> But the words of Theodore demand a large conception of God's dealings in the universe, whereby He converteth even the rebellion of His creatures into an occasion of setting forth His goodness and glory. Otherwise, if he meant that God was actively and immediately the

<sup>1</sup> Fragmenta Theodori Mopsuesteni, *apud* Concil. Constant. II

Collat. iv. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. V. p. 449.

author of Evil, the assertion would be blasphemous, and merit the anathema pronounced upon it by Pope Vigilius in his *Constitutum*; who says, "The holy Catholic Church holds and believes this as certain that GOD both hindered the first man from sin and through his disobedience justly punished sin; but, well employing even our evils, by a singular remedy He hath delivered us from all bonds of sins through the Incarnation, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of His Only-Begotten SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST."<sup>m</sup>

Origen, in accepting free will as the readiest mode of accounting for the origin of Evil, threw back the miscarriage attending its exercise to a condition of being which existed before the Creation recorded by Moses. "GOD," he says, "to Whom it seemed just to allot His creation according to merit, hath drawn the diversities of minds into the harmony of the one universe, like one house, in which there should be not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth, and some to honour but others to dishonour, that with these different vessels or souls or minds He might adorn it. And these causes of its diversity (as I think) this world hath received, while He dispenses each particular according to the variety of its motions or purpose. By which too the Creator will not appear unjust; but He hath distributed to every one in proportion to his desert according to preceding causes."<sup>n</sup> But the effect of such a theory inevitably is, to make this world a sort of prison-house and disciplinary institution for beings, who have in a greater or lesser degree failed in their moral probation elsewhere. Whence Augustine says, "I wonder that a man so learned and trained in Church lore did not mind how contrary this were to the meaning of this Scripture of so great authority; which throughout all GOD's works adding 'And GOD saw that it was good,' and when all is completed introducing 'And GOD saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good,'<sup>o</sup> willed that no other cause of making the world be understood, but that good should proceed from Him Who is good. Where if no one had sinned, the world would have been adorned and

<sup>m</sup> Vigilius P. P. *Constitutum*, ap. Labbe. Tom. V. p. 363.

<sup>n</sup> Origen. *Peri Archon*, Lib. ii. c. 9.  
<sup>o</sup> Gen. i. 31.

replenished with good natures only. And for that there is sin, all things are not therefore filled with sins; when in heavenly places far the greater number of good beings preserves its natural order. Nor hath malevolence, because it would not preserve the order of nature, therefore escaped the laws of a righteous God Who well ordereth all things. For as a picture with a dark hue properly disposed, so the universe (if one could behold it) is beautiful even including sinners; although their deformity makes them uncomely, considered by themselves." <sup>p</sup>

"The whole plot of the world," says Dr. Henry More, "being contrived by infinite Wisdom and Goodness, we cannot but surmise that the most sad representations are but a show, but the delight real to such as are not wicked and impious; and that what the ignorant call Evil in this universe is but as the shadowy strokes in a fair picture, or the mournful notes in music, by which the beauty of the one is more lively and express, and the melody of the other more pleasing and melting." <sup>q</sup> I doubt, however, but that Origen was right in searching for the source of Evil beyond the actual Fall of Man; for Evil existed ideally in the original imperfection of the Creature, and God Whose prevision controls the universe pronounced the visible world 'very good' according to His intellect, which balances all interests even of the world of worlds. (Leibniz, *Théodicée*, Pt. I. §. 20. II. §. 156.) Physical Evil appears to follow from the shifting necessity of Matter, as metaphysical Evil doth from the limitation inherent in the nature of created things. And by analogical reasoning moral Evil originates in the inordinate inclination of the creature in balancing its confused perceptions of Good and its opposite. That Evil should be possible, is necessary; that Evil should actually exist, is contingent; but that which is not contingent passes from a potential into an active stage through the harmony of things, because it falls in with the best arrangement of the universe, whereof it forms a portion. (*Leibnitii Causa Dei Asserta*, §. 69.) S. Augustine himself puts the argument of the Manichæans so strongly as to impair his

<sup>p</sup> S. Aug. De Civitate Dei, Lib. xi. c. 23. Tom. VII. p. 289.

<sup>q</sup> Immortality of the Soul, c. xv. p. 212.

own solution, namely, the possibility of Man's sinning by reason of his imperfect goodness. But the forms of physical evil appear so vast and so independent of Man as to call for other solution. (*Contra Julian*. VI. Tom. VIII. col. 1293.)

In conclusion, I give in the words of Damascene the sense in which Evil is attributed to GOD in Holy Scripture. "It is customary in Holy Scripture to call the permission of GOD His operation; as when the Apostle saith in the Epistle to the Romans, 'Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?'<sup>r</sup> For He alone is the Creator of all, but it is not Himself that maketh them honourable or dishonourable, but each man's own purpose. And this is clear from what the same Apostle saith in the Second Epistle to Timothy; 'But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour and some to dishonour. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work.'<sup>s</sup> But it is evident, that the purification takes place voluntarily; for he saith, 'if a man purge himself.' But the consequent corresponding clause answers to it; 'but if he do not purge himself, he shall be a vessel unto dishonour, unmeet for the master's use, deserving to be broken.' The present passage, and the one 'For GOD hath concluded them all in unbelief,'<sup>t</sup> and the one, 'GOD hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear,'<sup>u</sup> all these we should understand, not as of GOD having wrought, but of His having permitted. And also when Scripture saith that GOD creates evil,<sup>v</sup> and, 'Shall there be evil in a city, and the LORD hath not done it?'<sup>w</sup> it doth not show GOD to be the cause of evils. But, whereas the term Evil is hard to be expressed, signifying two things; for one while it indicates that which is by nature evil, which is contrary to virtue and to the will of GOD, another while that

<sup>r</sup> Rom. ix. 21.

<sup>s</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21.

<sup>t</sup> Rom. xi. 32.

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* v. 8.

<sup>v</sup> Isa. xlv. 7.

<sup>w</sup> Amos iii. 6.

which is evil relatively to our apprehension, to wit, afflictions and calamities ; (but these in appearance are evil, being painful ; yet in reality, good, for to those that understand they become pledges of conversion and salvation ; ) these, Scripture saith, come to pass by God's means." \*

\* S. Jo. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, c. 96.



## CHAPTER XI.

## OF THE CREATION OF MAN.

Of the  
Image and  
Likeness of  
God.

§. 1. WHEN GOD had created the invisible world of spiritual beings and the visible world of material and animal substances, He last of all formed Man to connect the visible and invisible Creation. "And the LORD GOD formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."<sup>7</sup> "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them."<sup>8</sup> It is to be noticed that GOD is represented as saying before Man's creation, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness;"<sup>8</sup> but the text does not say absolutely that man *was* created *after the likeness of God* but simply 'in the image of God.' By 'the image of God' is signified the intellectual nature and freedom of will given to Man in the very act of Creation; while 'the likeness of God' was not an accomplished fact but an inchoate only. The source and proof of necessary truths in the natural order is found in the understanding of Man; while truths of fact come by experience and observation through the senses. The senses can justify and confirm the former class of truths, but cannot demonstrate their unfailing certainty. Hence natural Religion and Philosophy may teach us concerning the Image of God; but it is reserved for Revelation to expound what makes up the Likeness of GOD. That image, though fractured by the Fall of Man, retains the innate light of simple ideas and the native freedom of the will, though the will be inclined to evil.

<sup>7</sup> Gen. ii. 7.

<sup>8</sup> *Ib.* i. 27.

<sup>\*</sup> *Ib.* v. 26.

But the likeness is to be restored by GOD's grace and assistance, but not without the co-operation of Man's own free will and choice. And therefore the first thing we read of after his creation is, that GOD placed him in a state of happiness, to which a single restriction was attached; which was to serve as a test of his obedience and gratitude to his Maker. And when the serpent tempted the woman to violate the restriction, the inducement to transgression is not obscurely connected with an allusion to the wished-for 'likeness of GOD;' "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." <sup>b</sup> And, as a close analogy is traceable between the first Man and that Second Adam, Who was to reverse the Fall by His own complete obedience; I think it is not without reference to His attaining that true 'likeness of GOD,' which the first Adam forfeited, that it is prophesied of Immanuel, "Butter and honey shall He eat, that He may know to refuse the evil and choose the good." <sup>c</sup> "In every man," says an ancient writer, "there is the image of GOD, but not in all His likeness; save where there is a benignant soul and a pure mind." <sup>d</sup> And S. John saith of the LOGOS or WORD of GOD universally, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." <sup>e</sup> For "in Him was life; and the life was the light of men." <sup>f</sup> Yet the Light did not at once constitute likeness to GOD; for "the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." <sup>g</sup> But that the likeness is in part attainable is proved by the injunctions of CHRIST, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your FATHER also is merciful," <sup>h</sup> and, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your FATHER Which is in heaven is perfect." <sup>i</sup> In common with Plato, Leibniz, and the Schoolmen, I hold that those innate ideas or common notions, those fundamental assumptions, which come not to men by individual experience, but of which they are conscious simultaneously with the objects of sense, are intellectually what the primary notions of goodness and justice are morally, something divine and eternal; the one, flashes of the Divine

<sup>b</sup> *Ib.* iii. 5.

<sup>c</sup> *Isa.* vii. 15.

<sup>d</sup> *Recognitiones S. Clementis, ap. Cotelierii PP. Apostolicos, Tom. I. p. 546.*

<sup>e</sup> *S. John* i. 9.

<sup>f</sup> *Ib.* i. 4.

<sup>g</sup> *Ib.* i. 5.

<sup>h</sup> *S. Luke* vi. 36.

<sup>i</sup> *S. Matt.* v. 48.

Intellect—the other, characters of the Law of GOD written in the heart. (Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*.) If then the Incarnate Word be the Light, which lighteth (not the baptized only, but) every man that cometh into the world, being the Lamp of conscience within him, may we not thence derive hope as to the salvability of such as have not utterly proved false to its monitions? May we not say, that music, the fine arts, the perception of the beautiful, all that transcends the physical wants of Man, are designed for the soul, and recall an immortal and divine existence, the remembrance and regret whereof dwell simultaneously in our heart?

Of Body,  
Soul, and  
Spirit.

§. 2. We read of the formation of Man's body; and, on GOD's breathing into it, that "Man became a living soul." But in the New Testament S. Paul seems to teach a threefold division (or *trichotomy*, as it has been called) of Man's nature, where he prays GOD that the "whole spirit and soul and body (of the Thessalonians) might be preserved blameless unto the coming of our LORD JESUS CHRIST."<sup>1</sup> This celebrated division formed the ground of many daring assumptions among the ancient heretics, and has not been without its influence in certain speculations concerning Predestination and Election. Persons have been prone to imagine a system of *caste* in the original constitution of Nature, arising from causes independent of and antecedent to Man's free will and action. To give a specimen of such speculations: it was said, that Divine "Wisdom planted the spiritual seed in Adam, that his bone, the rational and heavenly soul, might not be empty, but full of spiritual marrow. But of Adam three natures are begotten; first, the irrational, whereof was Cain; second, the rational and righteous, whereof was Abel; and third, the spiritual, whereof was Seth. And the man of the earth is according to the image, and the animal man according to the likeness of GOD, but the spiritual according to that which is proper to GOD. Many are the material men (*οἱ ἰλικοί*), but not many the animal (*οἱ ψυχικοί*), of rare occurrence the spiritual. The spiritual is by nature salvable; and the animal, being possessed of free will, hath an aptitude for faith and immortality and for disbelief and corruption according to its

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. v. 23.

own choice ; but the material by nature perisheth.”<sup>k</sup> On the other hand, Gennadius of Marseilles distinctly denies that the spirit is a third element in Man’s nature, but evidently wavers ; asserting in the same passage the identity of soul and spirit, and then that by ‘spirit’ is meant the grace of the HOLY SPIRIT.<sup>l</sup> But I need scarcely stop to dwell on the unfairness of making an external influence of what the Apostle designates so emphatically as ‘*your* whole spirit and soul and body.’ Yet we cannot form any notion of spirit as distinct from soul. We are conscious of our bodily existence by the fact of external motion (to say no more). We sit still, and are conscious of an internal existence, apparently independent of the body, by the fact of thought, of ratiocination, and of reflection. If we attempt to give a definition of what we mean by ‘Body,’ perhaps the most abstract conception of it will be that of “a substance impenetrable and discernible.” Nor can we frame any fitter definition of ‘Soul’ than the contrary to this, namely, “a substance penetrable and indiscernible.”<sup>m</sup> Can we conceive any essential or substantial distinction between soul and spirit, any distinction, that is, which goes beyond relation only ? Is it not true, that we have no faculties for more than ascertaining the existence of life above and beyond the obvious conditions of matter ? I come to the conclusion, that, when we strip the descriptions of soul and spirit of their rhetorical colouring, we shall find the *spirit* to mean only the soul in its highest condition, that is, in direct relation to the SPIRIT of GOD and as it acts under His guidance. Thus the ancient Christian Apologist, Tatian : “We know of two differences of spirits, whereof the one is called *soul* ; but the other, greater than the soul, and the image and likeness of GOD. But both existed in primæval Man, that he might be partly material, partly above matter.”<sup>n</sup> It is true, he considers the soul as perishable without this Divine influence called ‘spirit ;’ but altogether the notion

<sup>k</sup> Theodoti Epitomæ, *ad calcom* Opp. S. Clementis Alexandrini, p. 571.

<sup>l</sup> De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, cap. 20. *ap.* S. Aug. Opp. Tom. VIII. *ad calcom*, p. 78.

<sup>m</sup> More’s Immortality of the Soul, chap. iii. p. 21.

<sup>n</sup> Tatianus, *Contra Græcos*, p. 150 ; *ad calcom* Opp. S. Justini Martyris.

of spirit seems to be that of a faculty or quality, not that of an independent essence. Thus, referring to S. John's language about the LOGOS, he says : "The WORD is the light of GOD, but the uninformed soul is darkness. Wherefore dwelling alone she stoops to matter, perishing along with the flesh ; but, when she hath obtained the fellowship of the Divine SPIRIT, she is not unaided, but ascends to the regions where the spirit leads her to ; for its dwelling is above, but her birth is from beneath. The spirit then originally dwelt in company with the soul ; but, when she would not follow him, the spirit forsook her."° This was the notion of the learned Henry Dodwell, who connected the soul's immortality with baptism as an instrumental cause.

Another ancient writer regards 'spirit' as a peculiar quality or aptitude of the soul ; saying, "When GOD made man after His image and likeness, He inserted into His work a certain breath and fragrance of His Divinity ; that men being hereby made partakers of his Only-Begotten (SON), might also through Him be friends of GOD and sons of adoption."ª I find S. Augustine's statement most satisfactory. "There are three parts, of which man consists, spirit, soul, and body ; which again are called two, because the soul is often named along with spirit. For a certain rational part of the same, which beasts possess not, is called *spirit* ; our ruling principle (τὸ ἡγεμόνικον) is spirit ; then, the life, whereby we are joined to the body, is called *soul* ; lastly, the body itself, since it is visible, is the last we come to. But this 'whole creature groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now ;'ª it hath yielded however the firstfruits of the spirit, because it hath believed GOD and is now of good will. This spirit is also called *mind*, of which the Apostle saith, 'with the mind I myself serve the law of GOD,'ª and in another place, 'For GOD is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit.'ª But the soul, since it still seeks after carnal goods, is named *flesh*. For a certain part of it resisteth the spirit, not by nature, but by the habit of sinning. Whence it is said,

° *Ib.* p. 152.

ª Recogn. S. Clementis, Lib. iv.  
c. 9. T. I. p. 534.

ª Rom. viii. 22.

ª *Ib.* vii. 25.

ª *Ib.* i. 9.

‘with the mind I serve the law of GOD, but with the flesh the law of sin.’ Which habit has become nature according to mortal generation by the sin of the first man. And therefore it is written, ‘And we sometime were by nature the children of wrath,’<sup>†</sup> that is, of vengeance, whereby it came to pass that we should serve the law of sin. But the nature of the soul is perfect, when it is subject to its spirit, and when it follows GOD Who attends it. Therefore ‘the natural (or the *animal*) man receiveth not the things of the SPIRIT of GOD.’”<sup>‡</sup> Another writer says: “The soul itself hath many names by reason of the actions which it performs, whereas it is one substance. While it contemplates GOD, it is spirit; while it feels, sense; while it understands, mind; while it discerns, reason; while it consents, will; while it recollects, memory; while it animates the members, life. And these indeed, while they have manifold appellations, are not so divided in substance, as in name; because they are all one soul.”<sup>§</sup> I may add, that Origen also describes the spirit, as, “that better part of the soul, which was made after the image and likeness of GOD.”<sup>¶</sup> And he illustrates the distinction of soul and spirit from the Gospel’s ascribing to our SAVIOUR some things under the name of soul, others under that of spirit. “For, when He would indicate any suffering or perturbation of His He doth so under the name of ‘soul,’ as when He saith; ‘Now is My soul troubled,’<sup>‡</sup> and, ‘My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death,’<sup>¶</sup> and, ‘I lay it (that is, My life or soul) down of Myself.’<sup>¶</sup> But He commends into His FATHER’S hands, not His ‘soul,’ but His ‘spirit;’ and when He saith that the flesh is weak, He saith not that the ‘soul’ is willing, but the ‘spirit.’ Whence the soul seems to be a certain mean between the weak flesh and the willing spirit.”<sup>¶</sup> It should be noticed that Leibniz not only allows souls to

<sup>†</sup> Eph. ii. 3.

<sup>‡</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 14. S. Aug. De Fide et Symbolo, §. 23. Opp. Tom. VI. p. 162. Compare the remarks of Zonaras, *apud* Beveregii Pandectas Canonum, Tom. I. p. 61.

<sup>¶</sup> Etherii Episc. Uxamensis et Beati Presb., De Adoptione Christi, Adv. Elipandum Archiepisc. Tole-

tanum, Lib. i. *ap.* Biblioth. Maximam Patrum, Tom. XIII. p. 377.

<sup>¶</sup> Peri Archon, Lib. ii. c. 11. p. 448.

<sup>‡</sup> S. John xii. 27.

<sup>¶</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 38.

<sup>¶</sup> S. John x. 18.

<sup>¶</sup> *Ib.* Lib. ii. c. 8. p. 444.

beasts, imperishable, but not immortal, as lacking conscience, the power of forming distinct conceptions, the consciousness of being, or whatever besides makes up personal responsibility ; but further sees therein a sound argument in aid of the immortality of the human soul (*Nouveaux Essais*, II. §. 12. *Théodicée*, I. §. 89.) The interest GOD takes in the brute creatures is strongly marked in Jonah iv. 11 ; and was rightly inferred by the primitive Canarians, who in time of drought caused the bleating ewes and lambs to plead for relief.

Of the Pre-  
existence of  
the Soul.

§. 3. To what has already been advanced concerning the co-formation of Man's body and soul, it may be objected, first, that the soul came to be connected with the body from a previously existing state ; secondly, that, granting the original creation of the soul of the first man, the souls of his posterity are but grafts derived from the parent stock. The notion of the pre-existence of souls has much to recommend it. It is tempting, in so far as it offers a ready solution of the difficulties which meet us in the arrangements of Providence. It was entertained in the earliest ages of the world. In the words of our English Platonist, Dr. Henry More ; " If we can believe the Cabbala of the Jews, we must assign it to Moses, the greatest philosopher certainly that ever was in the world ; to whom you may add Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Epicharmus, Empedocles, Cebes, Euripides, Plato, Euclid, Philo, Virgil, Marcus Cicero, Plotinus, Iamblichus, Proclus, Boethius, Psellus, and several others which it would be too long to recite. And if it were fit to add Fathers to Philosophers, we might enter into the same list Synesius and Origen. [Besides, Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus.] \* • Cardan also, that famous philosopher of his age, expressly concludes, that the rational soul is both a distinct being from the soul of the world, and that it does pre-exist before it comes into the body ; and, lastly, Pomponatius, no friend to the soul's immortality, yet cannot but confess, that the safest way to hold it is also therewith to acknowledge her pre-existence." <sup>b</sup> The notion is thus stated ; that " Souls did once subsist in some other state ; where, in several manners and degrees, they forfeited the favour of their Creator. And so according to

<sup>b</sup> Immortality of the Soul, chap. xii. §. 11. p. 113.

that just Nemesis that He has interwoven in the constitution of the universe and of their own natures they undergo several calamities and asperities of fortune and sad drudgeries of fate, as a punishment inflicted, or a disease contracted from the several obliquities of their apostasy. Which key is not able to unlock that recondite mystery of some particular men's almost fatal averseness from all religion and virtue, their stupidity and dulness and even invincible slowness to these things from their very childhood, and their uncorrigible propension to all manner of vice; but also of that squalid forlornness and brutish barbarity, that whole nations for many ages have lien under, and many do still lie under, at this very day." <sup>c</sup> S. Augustine favours this view, saying, "Heaven is *our home*, which in the course of a possibly long pilgrimage we have forgotten." (*In Psalm. xxxii. Enarrat. III. §. 6.*) And Bishop Butler; "There are natural appearances of our being in a state of degradation." Mr. Capel Berrow, in his *Tractate on a Lapse of Souls in a state of pre-existence*, labours to prove that it arose from their association (*before birth*) with the apostate Powers of darkness (ch. x.). See Job xxxviii. 2. Jeremiah i. 5. Wisdom viii. 20. S. Matt. xvii. S. John xviii. 5. The Carpocratian heretics, evidently Platonists, attributed the superiority of the soul of JESUS to its purer and more perfect reminiscence of GOD in the pre-existent state. (S. Irenæus, I. 25.) Traces of the notion are found in the Book of Wisdom, where Solomon is made to say of himself; "For I was a witty child, and had a good spirit. Yea rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled." <sup>d</sup> And, what is of more importance, the question was put to our LORD concerning the man which was blind from his birth, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" and it elicited no censure, but merely a reply that his being born blind arose not in this instance from any previous sins. "JESUS answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of GOD should be made manifest in him." <sup>e</sup> We cannot assume that the reply would exclude the possibility of a man's being born blind in consequence of his parent's sin; for the denuncia-

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* §. 8. p. 112.

<sup>d</sup> *Wisd. viii. 19, 20.*

<sup>e</sup> S. John ix. 2, 3.



tion pronounced against the house of Eli<sup>f</sup> and the death of the adulterous issue of David and Bathsheba<sup>g</sup> teach us the contrary. Neither by parity of reasoning will it exclude the possibility of a man's own sin in another and pre-existent state being the cause of certain evil attending his birth. But, on the other hand, we are conscious of our soul and body existing as correlatives, not as originally alien to each other, which a certain theory of the soul's pre-existence seems to imply. And, though Revelation teaches us that the soul exists separate from the body after death, the very same authority insists on this as an abnormal condition of the soul, and points to its future reunion with the body in the Resurrection.<sup>h</sup>

S. Augustine appears to have entertained a notion nearly allied to that of the pre-existence of the soul; where he suggests, that, as the seminal reason of the human body was involved in the production of matter, so the causal reason of the soul was brought into existence in the creation of angels and invisible substances.<sup>i</sup> "But," says Aquinas, "if the soul is united to the body as its form, and is naturally a part of human nature, this cannot be at all. For it is manifest, that God instituted the first things in the perfect state of their nature, according as each particular thing required. But the soul, being a part of human nature, hath not its natural perfection save as it is united to the body. Whence it would not have been suitable for the soul to be created without the body.<sup>j</sup> But I submit that this objection is fairly met by Leibniz's theory of *pre-established harmony*, that is, the perfect mutual accord originally settled between the substances of body and soul, whereby the one following its own laws meets what the other requires.

The chief arguments against the notion of the pre-existent state are these. *a.* It seems inconsistent with the

<sup>f</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 32, 33.

<sup>g</sup> 2 Sam. xii. 18.

<sup>h</sup> See S. Maximi Scholia in Gregorium Theologum, p. 30; *ad calcem* Opp. Jo. Scoti Erigenæ.

<sup>i</sup> "Credatur ergo si nulla Scripturarum auctoritas seu veritatis ratio contradicit, hominem ita factum sexto die, ut corporis quidem humani ratio causalis in elementis

mundi, anima vero jam ipsa crearetur, sicut primitus conditus est dies, et creata lateret in operibus Dei, donec eam suo tempore sufflando, hoc est, inspirando, formato ex limo corpori insereret." S. Aug. De Genesi ad litteram, Lib. vii. c. 24. Tom. III. p. 222.

<sup>j</sup> S. Tho. Summa, I. qu. 90. art. 4.

theory of Redemption, which is a recovery of Man to a condition of innocence and happiness which he had forfeited by the sin of the first men in Eden. But if the state of Man in Eden be taken allegorically, as Damascene teaches, then "our life's star hath had elsewhere its setting" outside this world or the present condition of things.  $\beta$ . When God created mankind, He "blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth;"<sup>k</sup> which is irreconcilable with the Platonic notion of the body's being a prison-house of the soul. Not so: for the blessing was given antecedently to the penalties afterwards attached, and applies not to Man's future state. Nor, consequently, to a pre-existent state.  $\gamma$ . S. Paul represents, not the body, but its corruptible and mortal condition, as the burthen which we desire to be released from: "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."<sup>l</sup> It is precisely the corruptible body that Plato deemed a prison-house.  $\delta$ . Estius notices another painful consequence of admitting the notion, namely, that we should have to allow that CHRIST's soul must have sinned before its union with His Body in the Virgin's womb; which would be blasphemous.<sup>m</sup> If the soul of CHRIST pre-existed potentially in the nature of Adam, we are bound to believe that its very destination preserved it Immaculate; and so to ante-date the Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

§. 4. If souls do not independently pre-exist, the question arises, Do they not proceed from one common stock? Are they not derived by separate *decisions* from that parent soul, which was breathed into Adam by the Author of Life Himself? We may imitate and admire the caution, with which

Of Transi-  
clanism.

<sup>k</sup> Gen. i. 28.

<sup>l</sup> 2 Cor. v. 4.

<sup>m</sup> Estius, in Sent. L. ii. Dist. 27, §. 8. It is curious to observe how the ancient heretics attempted to meet the difficulty, but unsuccessfully; "Carpocrates autem et qui ab eo mundum quidem et ea quæ in eo sunt ab Angelis multo inferioribus ingenito Patre factum esse dicunt. Jesum autem à Joseph

natum, et qui similis reliquis hominibus fuerit, distasse à reliquis secundum id, quod anima ejus, firma et munda cum esset, commemorata fuerit quæ visa essent sibi in ea circumlatione, quæ fuisset in ingenito Deo; et propter hoc ab Eo missam esse ei virtutem, uti mundi fabricatores effugere posset." (S. Irenæus, Adv. Hæreses, L. i. c. 24.)

some ancient African bishops, acting (as is believed) under the inspiration of S. Fulgentius, express themselves on this subject. "The question of souls," say they, "we ought either to leave in silence, or to treat without contention; because, whether they come from propagation, or are made new to each body, that which the authority of Holy Scriptures doth not manifestly pronounce ought to be inquired into with caution; chiefly what the faithful may pass by without detriment to the faith."<sup>a</sup>

In their own country, Tertullian had, centuries before, pronounced in favour of *Traducianism* or 'transplanting.' "They," he says, "who superinduce the soul on the flesh after birth, to wit, when the flesh has been already formed, prejudge to the soul the male or female sex on the side of the flesh. But the inseparate seeds of either substance and their united suffusion undergo the common event of birth, wherever the reason of nature, whatever it is, hath drawn the lines. At least here too the form of the originals attests itself; when the male is the sooner formed, for Adam was first; the female somewhat later, for Eve was later. Thus for a while the flesh was shapeless, such as it was taken out of Adam's side; yet it was also already animal, because I should acknowledge it to be animate even when still a portion of Adam. But God's breath would have animated it, if there had not been in the female a graft out of Adam, as of his flesh, so also of his soul."<sup>o</sup>

Of Creationism.

§. 5. On the other side, S. Jerome distinctly holds for *Creationism*, 'or immediate existence from GOD in the body which nature prepareth for it,' (Thornd. *Of the Cov. of Grace*, c. x. §. 13), saying; "Cain and Abel, the first men of the first men, whence had they souls? all mankind in succession, to what commencements of souls is it traced? whether from a graft, according to the brute animals, that as body from body, so soul may be generated of soul; or have rational creatures been by degrees dropped down to earth

<sup>a</sup> Epist. Synodica Epp. Africanorum, circ. A.D. 521, §. 24. *ap.* Labbe, Tom. IV. p. 1599. Vid. S.

Greg. Magni Epist. 54, Regist. Lib. vii. Tom. IV. p. 270.

<sup>o</sup> Tert. De Anima, cap. 36, p. 292. See cap. 20, p. 278.

from a desire of bodies, and at last imprisoned in human bodies? Or doubtless, (what is Church-teaching according to the SAVIOUR's words, 'My FATHER worketh hitherto, and I work,'<sup>p</sup> and that of Zechariah, 'Which formeth the spirit of man within him,'<sup>q</sup> and in the Psalms, 'He fashioneth their hearts alike,'<sup>r</sup>) doth GOD daily frame souls, with Whom to will is to have done, and Who ceases not to be Creator?"<sup>s</sup> These texts conclude nothing to the purpose; for they do not assert *when* the soul was created. And Gennadius: "We believe that the souls of men are not from the beginning among other intellectual natures, nor created together, as Origen imagines. But we say, that the Creator of all Alone knows the creation of the soul, and that the body is only sown by means of wedlock, but by GOD's judgment condensed in the womb and compacted and fashioned; and that, when the body is already fashioned, the soul is created and infused, that man consisting of soul and body may live in the womb, and may come alive out of the womb, full of human substance."<sup>t</sup> An ingenious old Protestant divine of the Anglican Church accounts for the infection of the soul upon its junction with the body by comparison with the pollution of the purest spirit of wine if poured into a filthy vessel. (Simon Harward, *Discourse of the Soul*, &c., ch. vi. London, 1604.) But the justice of the Creator is arraigned, if we assume that punishment attends an involuntary union.

Aquinas enters into the reasons against Traducianism thus: "It is impossible that the active virtue which is in matter should extend its action to the production of an immaterial effect. But it is manifest that the principle of intellect in man transcends matter; for it has an operation, in which the body communicates not. Therefore it is impossible, that the seminal virtue should be productive of the intellectual principle." Separating then the purely intellectual

<sup>p</sup> S. John v. 17.

<sup>q</sup> Zech. xli. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Ps. xxxiii. 15.

<sup>s</sup> S. Hieron. ad Pammachium adv. Jo. Hierosol. cap. 6; Opp. Tom. I. p. 217.

<sup>t</sup> De Eccles. Dogmatibus, cap.

14. So also Theodoret: Οὐ θύραθεν

ποθεν τῆς ψυχῆς εἰσπρινομένης, οὐδέ γε ἐκ τῆς γονῆς φυσομένης, ἀλλὰ γε τῷ θεῷ δρῶν κατὰ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐντεθέντα ἐν τῇ φύσει νόμον δεχομένης τὴν γένεσιν. (De Græcar. Affectionum Curatione, Serm. v. Opp. Tom. IV. p. 552; and Damascene, (De Orth. Fide, cap. 29.)

functions of the soul from those where the body is her necessary instrument, he concludes, that "to lay down that the intellectual soul is caused by the generating agent is nothing else than to maintain that it subsists not, and by consequence is corrupted with the body. And therefore it is heretical to say that the intellectual soul is *traduced* along with the seed."<sup>a</sup> More also, in his advocacy of the Pre-existence of Souls, notices that the result of Traducianism is to make the soul a 'discerptible essence,' and consequently corruptible and mortal; but his argument makes not against Creationism.<sup>b</sup> Leibniz justly notices that the theory of Creationism offers the greatest difficulty to the dogma of Original Sin. For, how can a soul created pure incur damnation by an arbitrary association with a tainted body? He endeavours to show a mode of pre-existence of souls in a germinal condition from the day of Creation, endowed with perception and sentiment, but not with reason or the conscience, which constitutes Personality, somewhat after the notion supplied us by *Undine*; but yet inherent in Adam so as to share his admission of sin, and acquiring the gift of Reason, when the time of their animating a human body is arrived. Souls, gifted with a certain perception yet unconscious of it, may inhere in ancestral souls. (*Théodicée*, Pt. I. §§. 89-91.) This unconscious exercise of perception Leibniz terms *Apperception*. And I venture to think that the ancient belief in dreams, as witnessed by Eliphaz in the Book of Job, supports this; and so, that the presumed *insensibility* of the soul in sleep fails to establish the notion of the final extinction of the souls in Hades.

Akin to this subject, I think, is that "something mysteriously great and noble in the first years of our life, the paradisiacal bloom that did then dwell on the face of things; the soft and solemn delight that even a balmy air or a sunny landskip did then excite." (The Moravian bishop Gambold

<sup>a</sup> 8. Tho. Summ. l. qu. 118, art. 2. See also qu. 90, art. 2.

<sup>b</sup> "How this newly-created soul is infused by GOD, no man knows; nor how, if it be traduced from

the parents, both their souls contribute to the making up a new one." (Immortality of the Soul, Book ii. ch. 13.)

quoted by Southey, *Commonplace-Book*, II. p. 10.) Amiel also supports this view, when he makes *faith* "the heritage of the individual at his birth, and a recollection of that vague Eden where he dwelt in a somnambulist state, *anterior to his individual life*." (*Journal Intime*, Tom. II. p. 132.) 'That dreamlike vividness and splendour' which attends the vision of childhood commends the notion of pre-existence to poets. Henry Vaughan sings of the days, "when yet I had not walk'd above A mile or two from my first Love." And Wordsworth echoes Augustine, saying, "But trailing clouds of glory do we come From God Who is our home." (*Ode on Immortality*.)

## CHAPTER XII.

## OF PARADISE, OF THE FALL OF MAN, AND OF ORIGINAL SIN.

Theories  
concerning  
the Garden  
of Eden.

§. 1. WHEN GOD had formed Man, we are told that he "put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." \* Every circumstance indicating a local reality is supplied by Moses. It was in Eden 'eastward' of the wilderness where the author of the Pentateuch was sojourning. Eden was undoubtedly a district of Babylonia, mentioned by Rabshakeh, "the children of Eden which were in Thelasar;" † the latter being probably the Tel-harsa of Ezra, ‡ and Tel-haresha of Nehemiah. § The rivers Hiddekel and Euphrates leave no room to suppose that Moses meant to convey a different signification from what the names stood for in popular apprehension; though his later interpreters did their best to perplex his narrative by introducing the impossible combination of Pison and Gihon as the Ganges and the Nile. The garden or park (*παράδεισος*), which "the LORD GOD planted," and wherein grew "every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food," might harmonise with accounts, which were likely to reach the rovers of the desert, of those terrace-gardens and spacious parks planted by Eastern kings probably since the days of Ninus. But it is hardly safe to suppose that Moses merely furnished an apologue, to shadow forth a spiritual fact; when he has taken care to fence his account with incidents of a statistical kind Ethiopia, Havilah, and Assyria are mentioned as vouchers for the historical character of the narrative. It is strange then that those who accede to this view should have laboured to render it incredible by their admix-

\* Gen. ii. 15.

† 2 Kings xix. 12.

‡ Ezra ii. 59.

§ Nehem. vii. 61.

ture of poetical fancies. Tertullian makes Paradise to be separated from the knowledge of the common world by some fence of a fiery zone ;<sup>a</sup> Lombard, following the *ordinary Gloss*, makes it reach the lunar circle, where the waters of the deluge could not sweep over it ;<sup>b</sup> Moses Bar-cepha interposes a vast ocean between it and the habitable world ;<sup>c</sup> while Damascene, following Theophilus of Antioch<sup>d</sup> and S. Basil,<sup>e</sup> describes it as "lying higher than all the earth, but temperate and illuminated with rarest and purest air, vegetating with ever-blooming trees, full of fragrance, replete with light, surpassing thought of all sensuous comeliness and beauty, truly a divine spot, and an abode worthy of him who was made after the image of God." <sup>f</sup>

Others again have reduced the whole narrative to an allegory. Thus Origen asks ; "Who is found so simple (*ita idiotas*) as to think that GOD as though He were a human agriculturist planted trees in Paradise eastwards in Eden and set the tree of life therein, that is, visible and palpable wood, so that a man eating with corporeal teeth might receive life from that tree, and again eating of another tree get knowledge of good and evil ? And that too, that GOD is said to walk in the garden in the cool of day,<sup>g</sup> and Adam to hide among the trees, I indeed suppose no one doubts but that these things are brought forward by Scripture in a figurative manner, in order that by them some mystical matters may be indicated." <sup>h</sup> He then justifies his interpretation, by what he conceives an insuperable difficulty similarly attending the literal understanding of the history of CHRIST's temptation, namely, how all the kingdoms of the world could be shown to Him literally "in a moment of time." <sup>i</sup> Nor is this view confined to a Father of dubious orthodoxy ; for Gregory Nazianzen, styled pre-eminently the Divine (*ὁ Θεόλογος*) by the admiring affection of the Eastern Church, scruples not to adopt it. "In this Paradise," he says, " (whatever this Paradise was,) (*ὅς τις ποτε ἦν ὁ παρά-*

<sup>a</sup> Apologeticus, cap. 47.

<sup>b</sup> Petrus Lombard. Sent. L. ii. Dist. 17.

<sup>c</sup> Estius, in Sent. L. ii. Dist. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Ad Autolycum, Lib. ii. p. 97.

<sup>e</sup> Homil. de Paradiso

<sup>f</sup> De Orth. Fide, cap. 23.

<sup>g</sup> Gen. iii. 8.

<sup>h</sup> Peri Archon, L. iv. c. 2.

<sup>i</sup> S. Luke iv. 5.



δεισος οὐτος,) GOD placed Man, having endowed him with free will, that Good might be his when he chose as well as it was His Who gave the seeds thereof; placed him, a dresser of immortal plants, perhaps of Divine thoughts both the simpler and the more perfect; naked in simplicity and guileless life and removed from all cover and pretence; for such it became the original man to be."<sup>j</sup> Scotus Erigena expands this notion in the following beautiful manner. "The true planting of GOD is Nature itself, which He created in Eden, that is, in the delights of eternal felicity and the beatitude of the Divine likeness, after His own image and likeness, that is, after an image entirely like Himself beside the reason of the subject: a planting greater and better than all the world of sense, not in bulk, but in dignity of nature. Whose fertile soil was a body by possibility immortal. For the body of the first man might not have died; nor would it have died, if it had not been corrupted by the poison of prevarication, but would have bloomed with the flowers of spiritual beauty, nor ever have waxed old with the advance of seasons. Whose water was the sense of an incorruptible body, capable of forms, fashioned by the phantasies of sensuous things without deception of falsehood; whose air enlightened by the rays of Divine Wisdom was reason, whereby it might know the nature of all things; whose ether was a soul, which revolved about the Divine Nature with an eternal and unerring motion in an immutable and yet a mutable state; and other things which may be said of the Divine image; yea too, since they cannot be understood, are to be honoured by silence."<sup>k</sup> So also More: "Adam was first wholly ethereal, and placed in Paradise, that is, in a happy and joyful condition of the spirit; for he was placed under the invigorating beams of the Divine Intellect, and the Sun of Righteousness then shone fairly upon him. And his soul was as the ground which GOD hath blessed, and so brought forth every pleasant tree and every goodly plant of her heavenly Father's own planting; for the HOLY SPIRIT of Life had enriched the soil, that it brought forth all manner of

<sup>j</sup> S. Greg. Nazians. Orat. 38, Opp. Tom. I. p. 619.

<sup>k</sup> Erigena, De Divisione Naturæ, Lib. iv. p. 203.

pleasant and profitable fruits. And the Tree of Life was in the midst of this garden of Man's soul, to wit, the Essential Will of God, which is the true root of regeneration: but so high a pitch Adam as yet had not reached unto. And the fruit of this tree in this ethereal state of the soul had been immortality or Life everlasting. And the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil was there also, to wit, his own will."<sup>1</sup>

But, as Aquinas observes, "Those things which are said in Scripture of Paradise are set forth by manner of historical narrative. But in all things which Scripture so delivers the truth of history is to be held for a foundation, and spiritual expositions are to be framed thereupon."<sup>m</sup> "Some then," says Damascene, "have imagined a Paradise of sense, others, one of intellect. But it seems to me, that, as Man was created sensitive at the same time and intellectual, so also his most sacred home was at the same time sensitive and intellectual, and possessed a double expression. For in the body Man dwelt in the divinest and most beautiful spot; but in the soul he abode in a higher and incomparable and far more beautiful place, having as his home GOD indwelling in him, and a glorious covering, being endued with His grace; and, as another Angel, feasting on the alone sweetest fruit of His contemplation, and being fed thereby."<sup>n</sup> Thorndike agrees with Damascene, that the account of Paradise 'possesses a double expression;' that, while the precept is manifestly carnal, it and the trees "are not understood, if they be not taken as symbolical and mystical." (*Of the Cov. of Grace*, c. xx. §. 18.)

§. 2. In this state of happiness God gave Man a commandment, that he should not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, to furnish an exercise of his free will. That tree was the contemplation of high and heavenly things, as the Mystical school will have it;° good indeed in itself, and profitable when taken seasonably, but unfit for man in

Of the  
Temptation  
and Fall of  
Man.

<sup>1</sup> The Philosophic Cabbala, chap. ii. §. 8, 9, p. 22.

<sup>m</sup> S. Tho. Summ. i. qu. 102, art. 1.

<sup>n</sup> De Orth. Fide, c. 28. Οὕτως διπλοῦν οἶμαι τὸν θεῖον παρὰδεισαν· καὶ ἄλλῃθως οἱ θεοφόροι πατέρες παρέδωκαν, οἱ τε οὕτως οἱ τε ἐκείνως διδάξαντες.

Vid. S. Aug. De Genesi ad litteram, Lib. viii. §. 1; Opp. Tom. III. p. 225.

<sup>o</sup> θεωρία γὰρ ἦν τὸ φυτόν, ὥς ἡ ἐμὴ θεωρία. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. xxxviii. p. 619.

the simple state of his infancy. At the suggestion of the serpent, actuated by the invisible spirit of Evil, he partook of the forbidden fruit, and thereby forfeited that likeness to his Maker in which he had been created.<sup>p</sup> The heinousness of Adam's transgression is shown by the fact, that, having been made in the likeness of GOD, and typifying in his own person the intellectual part of our nature, he was not exposed immediately to the temptation of the serpent; but by an act of will and a perversion of the affection he gave way to the suggestion of the woman, who being taken out of the side of the man typifies the lower and impulsive or appetitive part of our nature. For S. Paul saith, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."<sup>q</sup> So far then as Adam was not deceived and yet sinned, it brings his sin to a closer conformity with that of the fallen angels, who sinned without an external tempter. And so S. Paul suffers not a woman "to usurp authority over the man," giving as a reason, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve;" evidently, because the attributes of intellect and power, being the image of GOD in which Adam was created, are to be venerated even under their altered conditions; as "Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The LORD rebuke thee."<sup>r</sup>

In the account of the temptation of Eve three forms of sin may be noticed, answering to the threefold division of human nature. First, she listens to the suggestions of the serpent, when he denies the consequence which GOD had said would ensue on the transgression of His commandment, and when he attributes an evil motive to GOD's prohibition; "For GOD doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened."<sup>s</sup> Here are two spiritual sins against faith and love, sins of the intellect, unconnected with concupiscence. Then we have blended together the concu-

<sup>p</sup> That the agency of Satan was involved in that of the Serpent has been already noticed; Origen quotes an apocryphal book, the *Ascension of Moses*, to the effect, that Michael the Archangel disputing with the devil about the body of Moses saith

that the serpent inspired by the devil was the cause of the prevarication of Adam and Eve. (*Peri Archon*, Lib. iii c. 2, p. 457.)

<sup>q</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 14.

<sup>r</sup> S. Jude v. 9.

<sup>s</sup> Gen. iii. 5.

piscence or inordinate desire of the flesh, that is, of the soul as it acts in conjunction with the body ; “ And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise : ” lastly, the final accomplishment of the sin, “ she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat.” †

§. 3. The term ‘ Original Sin ’ was first brought in by S. Augustine and the Church of his time ; and it may be defined as “ an habitual inclination to sin bred in our nature from the fall of Adam.” (Thornd. *Of the Cov. of Gr.* c. xx. §. 14.) I cannot admit that it is equivalent to simple concupiscence, which with Taylor I hold is not wholly an effect of Adam’s sin, but hath its roots in the original imperfection of a material creature, being a “ natural consequence of man’s composition,” and “ the product of the material principle of his nature, originally inclined to the sensual good of the body.” (Thornd. *ibid.* §. 2.) “ All the inclinations of the sensual appetite were before the Fall,” as Thorndike and Taylor agree, “ *but the disorder of them by it.*” (*Ibid.* §. 35.) I trace the remote source of Original Sin to Matter and its imperfection, as supplying its ‘ nature ’ (*Article ix.*) and materials ; but its active power to the rebellion of the sensual appetite against Reason, (*Ib.* §. 28.) when Adam dethroned royal Reason from its place of authority assigned by GOD, and let in the republican rout of the passions in its room. Concupiscence, then, no longer held in check, but usurping the throne of Reason, “ *deserveth GOD’s wrath and damnation,*” that is, *deserveth* only, not ‘ *procureth* ; ’ for, though it “ doth remain in them that are regenerated,” that is to say, “ them that believe and are baptized,” yet “ there is no condemnation for them,” for the obedience of the second Adam is imputed to them as grafted into the Body whereof He is the Head. This first sin of the human race then consists of two parts ; first, it was a voiding of the love and duty which the creature owed primarily to his Creator, or a lack of original righteousness ; ‡ it was “ a dissolution of that harmony, in which

Of Original Sin.

† *Ib.* v. 6.

‡ “ *Carentia originalis justitiæ,*  
ut Anselmus dicit in libro De Con-

ceptu Virginali.” S. Tho. Summ. ii.  
qu. 82. art. 1.

consisted the reason of it.”<sup>v</sup> Secondly, from the aversion of the will from God followed disorder in all other energies of the soul. So then the privation of original righteousness whereby the will was subject to God is the distinguishing or *formal* part in original sin; but the disorder of the other energies of the soul is chiefly in inordinate pursuit of changeable good; which disorder may by a common name be called Concupiscence; and so Original Sin is *materially* concupiscence, but *formally* a defect of original righteousness.”<sup>w</sup>

Durandus seems to prefer taking the *formal* notion as the definition of original sin. “The Master of the Sentences,” he says, “saith that it is habitual concupiscence, or concupiscibility or fuel, or the law of the flesh and members, the sickness of nature and its tyrant; all of which he takes for one and the same thing, to wit, for the rebellion of the sensuous energies against reason, although owing to different causes. But the more common opinion is, that original sin is the being void of original righteousness, taken in connection with the debt incurred of possessing it and the desert of lacking it: which desert others call Guiltiness, agreeing in the thing signified, but differing in the naming. Let us therefore hold the thing all hold in common; and let contentious men dispute about words.”<sup>x</sup>

Of the corruption of Nature by the Fall of Man.

§. 4. Such was the first great sin, an apostasy from faith in God, a chilling of love towards Him, and an inordinate license allowed to the material portion of Man's nature. It was a surrender of dominion over the body on the part of the spiritual being. It is described in its effects by S. Paul, when he speaks of the Gentiles as having “*yielded*” their “members, servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity;”<sup>y</sup> as “having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart;”<sup>z</sup> and as “putting off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.”<sup>a</sup> “Such force hath Original Sin that it

<sup>v</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>w</sup> *Ib.* art. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Durand. in Sent. ii. Dist. 30.

qu. 3. §. 13, 14.

<sup>y</sup> Rom. vi. 19.

<sup>z</sup> Eph. iv. 18.

<sup>a</sup> *Ib.* verse 22.

renders men yet unregenerate weak in the things of nature, in spiritual things dead; in the understanding inclined to the things of sense, in the will to carnal, so that by nature we be children of wrath." (*Leibnitii Causa Dei Asserta*, §. 86.) The deterioration, which resulted from Adam's Fall, did not terminate in himself, but extended to his posterity and to the earth and its inhabitants. With regard to the last, it is simply said in Genesis, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake."<sup>b</sup> But as God had, in blessing Man, commanded them to "replenish the earth, and subdue it, and to have dominion over every living thing that moveth upon the earth,"<sup>c</sup> it is only reasonable to suppose, that the subject and inferior creatures were as a matter of course involved in the curse and sorrows of their sovereign. Indeed, death, which affects them equally with Man, and decay, which appertains to inanimate forms of matter, could only triumph by sin; and Man alone, as possessed of conscience and free will, could sin; therefore S. Paul says, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."<sup>d</sup> In strict accordance with this view, S. Paul saith, "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."<sup>e</sup>

Luther enlarges thus on the same topic: "Here it appears how great a calamity followed sin. Since the earth, which is innocent and sinned not, is yet compelled to sustain the

<sup>b</sup> Gen. iii. 17.

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* i. 28.

<sup>d</sup> Rom. v. 12.

<sup>e</sup> *Ib.* viii. 18—22. I do not know on what principle the word *κτίσις*, which S. Paul employs uniformly above, should have been rendered 'creature' thrice by our Authorised Version, and in the last instance 'creation.'

So Theophilus of Antioch argues from the reversal of Adam's curse to the restitution of the brute creation; 'Ὅποταν οὖν πάλιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀναδράμῃ εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν, μηκέτι κακοποιῶν καὶ κείνα ἀποκατασταθήσεται εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡμερότητα. Ad Autoly-cum, Lib. ii. p. 96.

curse, and, as Paul saith, to be 'subject to vanity;' from which however it will be reclaimed at the last day which it waits for. For Pliny calls the earth a benign, mild, and indulgent mother, and a perpetual attendant on the service of mortals. But it feels its curse, as Paul showeth; first in that it produces not the good things which it would have done, if Man had not fallen; secondly in that it produces many noxious things which it would not have done, such as thorns, thistles, poisons, hurtful beasts; and if there be any other things of this sort, all these were brought in through sin. Nor do I doubt, but that, before sin was, the air was purer and more salubrious, the water more pregnant, yea, the sunlight also was more beautiful and bright. So that now the whole Creation in every part admonisheth us of the curse inflicted through sin."† The analogy between the Fall and the New Creation, the old and the new Adam, may carry with it, that Death was the outcome of Adam's sin; but I incline to the belief that it was natural, but would have been stayed by Man's being allowed to eat of the Tree of Life; seeing God drove him out of Paradise, lest having sinned he should eat thereof and so procure to himself immortal misery. To eat of the Tree of Life in a state of disobedience would only have put Man in the condition of the fallen angels.

Of the transmission of Original Sin.

§. 5. From Adam and Eve the infection of sin passed on to their posterity. So the Council of Orange declares; "If any one asserts that his prevarication injured Adam only and not his posterity; or maintains that the death of the body only, which is the penalty of sin, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul, passed through one man to all mankind, he will assign injustice to God, contradicting the Apostle who saith, 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by

† Luther. Enarrat. in Gen. c. iii. Opp. Tom. VI. p. 50. The lines of Lucretius seem to point to a general impression of this sort in the Pagan world;

"Haud (ut opinor) enim mortalia  
    sæcla superne  
Aurea de cælo demisit funis in  
    arva;  
Nec mare, nec fluctus plangentes  
    saxa crearunt:

Sed genuit tellus eadem, quæ nunc  
    alit ex se.  
Præterea nitidas fruges vinetaque  
    lætæ  
Sponte sua primum mortalibus ipsa  
    creavit;  
Ipsa dedit dulcibus foetus et pabula  
    lætæ,  
Quæ nunc vix nostro grandescunt  
    aucta labore."

Lib. ii. *circ. finem.*

sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”\* “Not from the creation of GOD,” says Pope Gelasius, “is the fault which nature hath gathered by its voluntary motion; yet even from nature vitiated by its own means GOD pursues the institution of His creation; but the creature brings forth faultiness, which it received not from the institution of the Creator, but through its own transgression. For if the first men themselves, born of no parents and formed without a stain, were yet able to deprave themselves through the ambition of illicit presumption and to annex to GOD’s work that of diabolical fraud, what wonder, if the same being depraved brought forth a depraved offspring? Even when GOD hath formed human nature, in His creation thereof, free, doth not slavery coming from without in human laws yet naturally render it bond and under liability? They are by origin begotten under liability, and from a servile condition are born slaves, and in being born become bond before they are born. And as human nature itself, being as regards its institution pure, hath polluted its will, being guilty of reprobate acts; so it hath brought forth its offspring, guilty of its acts, because it hath begotten it such as it hath rendered itself by excess of prevarication.”<sup>b</sup>

This position is supported by the institution of circumcision in the Law of Moses, and the purification enjoined on women after child-bearing; but, as the argument is identical with that used on behalf of infant baptism, I again quote Gelasius. “The Divine testimonies, and the very Sacraments of the Church, and the tradition of Catholic Doctors from the LORD and SAVIOUR Himself, teach, that the beginnings of human generation are stained. Hence it is, that Scripture saith; ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.’<sup>1</sup> ‘Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.’<sup>2</sup> ‘We were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.’<sup>3</sup> Of which wrath it saith in the Gospel, ‘He that believeth on the SON hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the SON shall not see life; but the

\* Conc. Arausic. ii. Canon ii.; *ap.*  
Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1667.

<sup>b</sup> Gelasii P. P. I. Ep. 7; *ap.*  
Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1176.

<sup>1</sup> Job xiv. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. li. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. ii. 3.



wrath of God abideth on him ;<sup>1</sup> that wrath, to wit, whereof it was said, 'Thou shalt surely die.'<sup>m</sup> Our LORD JESUS CHRIST Himself pronounces ; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you :'<sup>n</sup> where we see no one excepted, nor hath any one ventured to say that a child can be brought to eternal life without this salutary sacrament ; but without that life there is no doubt that it will be in perpetual death. Why then is an infant concluded in this condition, if it hath no sin at all ? And GOD will the rather seem unjust (GOD forbid !), if punishment be inflicted, where there is no fault. Whence, seeing it is held bound by no guilt of its own acts, nothing remains but that it is polluted by its sinful nativity alone ; and, if it be not cleansed by participation of the Christian Mystery, cannot reach everlasting life. Hence it is, that infants are breathed upon and catechised ; and, because in the work of GOD, which its Author well instituted, that of devilish malignity hath been added, being delivered 'from the power of darkness' (as the Apostle teacheth),<sup>o</sup> they are translated to the lot of a child of GOD and to legitimate purgation. For unless the first birth, which GOD created good, had become guilty by prevarication, and been rendered subject to reprobation ; the second birth would not have been substituted. Wherefore Paul saith, 'As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.'<sup>p</sup> The same reason for baptizing infants is authoritatively taught by the Council of Milevis (A.D. 416) : "For on account of this rule of faith, even infants, who have not yet been able to commit any sins in their own persons, are therefore truly baptized for the remission of sins, that what they have contracted by generation may in them be cleansed by regeneration."<sup>q</sup>

§. 6. If, having asserted the fact of the transmission of original sin, we inquire particularly into the manner of its transmission, it may be said that "All men who are born of

Of the mode  
of the trans-  
mission.

<sup>1</sup> S. John iii. 36.

<sup>m</sup> Gen. ii. 17.

<sup>n</sup> S. John vi. 53.

<sup>o</sup> Col. i. 13.

<sup>p</sup> Rom. v. 18. Gelas. *ubi supra*, p. 1178.

<sup>q</sup> Conc. Milevitan. ii. Canon. 2 ;  
*ap. Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1538.*

Adam may be considered as one man, in so far as they meet in the nature which they receive from their first parent; according as in the case of citizens all men who are of one community are reputed as one body, and the whole community as one man; as also Porphyry saith, that by participation of kind many men are one man. So then many men derived from Adam are members of one body: but the act of one member of the body, suppose the hand, is not voluntary by the will of the hand itself, but by the will of the soul, which first moves the member. The disorder, which is in a man born of Adam, is not voluntary by the will of himself, but by that of his first parent, who influences all who are derived from his stock; as the will of the soul moves all the members to action. Whence the sin, which is thus derived from the first parent to his posterity, is called *original*; as the sin, which is derived from the soul to the members of the body, is called *actual*. And as the actual sin, committed by some member, is not his sin except so far as he is a part of man himself, whereupon it is called human sin; so original sin is not the sin of this particular person, unless so far as he receives his nature from our first parent; whence it is also called the sin of nature, according to that saying, 'We were by nature the children of wrath.'<sup>r</sup> This notion of Aquinas' of Adam's summing up all mankind in his own person derives great support from S. Irenæus, saying that God recapitulates in Himself the old creation in reversing its miscarriages. (*Adv. Hæreses*, L. III. c. 20.) So that, as we are made heirs of eternal life through the new Adam, needs must we inherit death through the old Adam. But pursuing this analogy closely, I would argue, that, as regenerate Humanity was ideally present in its head, the WORD Incarnate, so the souls of fallen Humanity were potentially present in that of the first Man, (as the oak is virtually in the acorn,) and so actually participated in the disorder of appetite admitted by him in the Fall. Bearing due regard to the infinite value of the means provided by GOD to heal Man's transgression, I prefer a view (Leibniz's) that recognises the real guiltiness of all mankind to one (the Thomists') that

<sup>r</sup> Eph. ii. 3.—S. Tho. Summ. ii. qu. 81, art. 1.

depends on mere corporate or virtual participation, or to one (Catharinus's) that turns on a contract entered into by the head of a firm (so to say) without the sanction or privity of the members it is meant to bind.

Of the remains of original good in Man after the Fall.

§. 7. Although "all have" thus "sinned and come short of the glory of GOD,"\* yet we may safely affirm, that in a large sense the impress of GOD in Nature is indelible; that Man, once created after His 'image and likeness,' hath not by the Fall entirely broken that image, nor so forfeited that likeness, but that some refracted beams of its imperishable glory still remain; that the freedom of his will is of the essence of virtue; and that GOD illuminates to some extent even Man's unregenerate nature through the Divine faculty of Reason, wherein consists our participation in the image of GOD; for S. John says of the LOGOS generally, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."† The duty of love towards GOD and man is stamped on our very nature. Two considerations will suffice to show it. First, "There is no nation so barbarous, so rude and uninstructed, which bears to hear that its gods are not to be worshipped, which doth not reckon that an intolerable blasphemy, and which doth not vindicate it by fire and sword; so that, if any presume to say any such thing, it judges them worthy neither of teaching nor correction, but of punishments alone, unless they forthwith come to a better mind. Wherefore it is manifest that the honour of the Creator is one of the first impressions, when human nature cannot bear even a word against Him and so severely punishes it." Secondly, "The duty of innocence is also one of the first impressions, naturally stamped on the human heart; for there is not a human heart, which doth not in itself confess that naturally it ought not to hurt any one. But what nature universally confesses must needs be true. For it is impossible that nature should universally lie. Wherefore it is manifest that the duty of innocence is one of the first impressions and one of the things naturally known *per se*."‡ While confessing that our vices surpass our virtues naturally, apart from the bestowal

\* Rom. iii. 23.  
† S. John i. 9.

‡ Guillermus Parisiensis Episc.  
De Virtutibus, fol. 55.

of supernatural Grace, we may reject Augustine's paradox, that the virtues of the heathen were but *splendid vices*. The consideration of Profit or Pleasure did not always swallow up that of To KALON, the Just and Honourable; and, as Thorn-dike acutely remarks, "How should they be judged by the law of nature, (as S. Paul hints, Rom. ii. 12-16,) if they could not chuse but to transgress it?" (*Just Weights*, c. xi. §. 8.)

These primary impressions of good Origen terms 'Outlines or Introductions to Virtue' (*ὑποτυπώσεις ἢ ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς ἀρετήν*); for, against those heathens who degraded human nature by comparing it to the lower forms of animal life, he says; "And yet the rational animal, of whatever sort it be, having introductions to virtue, may not be reasonably compared to a worm. For these outlines in respect of virtue do not allow those to be compared to a worm who potentially (*δυνάμει*) possess virtue and who cannot in every way lose its seeds. Therefore it appears that men generally could not be worms, as in respect of GOD: for reason, having its origin from the WORD Who is from GOD, doth not allow the rational animal to be considered in every way estranged from GOD." He insists strongly on the necessity of free will to the making up the idea of virtue, saying; "If you take away from virtue the voluntary principle, you have taken away even its essence." Theodoret follows up the same line thus; "The Physician of souls doth not constrain the judgment of those that wish not to enjoy the cure: for, having created the rational nature sovereign and free, by exhortations and laws He both dissuadeth it from evil and urgeth it to good, but doth not compel it not wishing to partake of what is better, lest He should shift the boundaries of Nature. In this way too He crieth by the Prophets, 'If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land;' and again, 'What man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days, that he may see good? Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile. Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it.'" Tertullian excellently observes; "The

\* Origen. *Contra Celsum*, Lib. iv. p. 182.

\* *Ib.* p. 168.

\* *Isa.* i. 19.

\* Ps. xxxiv. 12-14.—Theod. De Græcarum Affectionum Curationes, Sermon. v. Opp. Tom. IV. p. 542.

corruption of nature is another nature, having its own god and father,\* to wit, the author himself of corruption; so however that good should exist in the soul, that principal, that divine and genuine and properly natural good. For what is from GOD is not so much extinguished as overshadowed; since it may be overshadowed, because it is not GOD; extinguished it cannot be, because it is from GOD. And thus, as a light hindered by some obstacle remains, but appears not, if the density of the obstacle be too great; so also good in the soul, being crushed by evil, according to its quality, is either entirely vacant when the light is hidden, or, beams forth when liberty is given. So there be some very bad and very good, and nevertheless all souls are one kind. So too in the worst there is some good, and in the best some thing of what is most evil. For GOD Alone is without sin; and the only man without sin is CHRIST, because He is also GOD. So too the divinity of the soul at present bursts forth, from its former good; and the consciousness of GOD comes forth in testimony; (*as, for instance,*) ‘Good GOD!’, ‘GOD seeth,’ and ‘I commend to GOD.’ Wherefore no soul is guiltless, because none is without the seed of good. Then, when it hath come to the Faith, being re-fashioned through the Second Birth of water and power from above, drawing aside the curtain of her pristine corruption, the soul beholdeth her own entire light. She is received also by the HOLY SPIRIT, as in her pristine birth (*she was received*) by the evil spirit. The flesh follows the soul when she weds the Spirit, as a dowry slave, and no longer the soul’s attendant but the Spirit’s.”\* It is in truth this remnant of GOD’s image and likeness in Man, expressed not only in the innate light of the intellect and its incomplex ideas, but also in the native liberty of the will, that justifies GOD in punishing sinners, and shows His law written in our hearts, though it be darkened by negligence and sensuality. (*Leibnitii Causa Dei Asserta*, §§. 97, 99.)

Yet, after all, the remains of original good in Man’s nature are but mere starting points (*ἀφορμαί*.) utterly insufficient of themselves to procure salvation, without a corresponding prevenient grace on the part of the HOLY SPIRIT. Even Origen,

\* 2 Cor. iv. 4. S. John viii. 44. \* Tert. De Anima, c. 41, p. 295.

who contends so strenuously on the side of free will, allows this; "For we assert," he says, "that it is impossible for a man to look up to GOD with virtue at the outset, for evil must needs be in men primarily; as Paul also saith, 'But when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.'"<sup>b</sup> We must say then with the Council of Orange; "If any one affirms that he can by the strength of nature think as is meet or choose any good belonging to the salvation of eternal life, or consent to Evangelical preaching, without the illumination of the HOLY GHOST, Who giveth to all men docility in consenting to and believing the truth, he is deceived by an heretical spirit; not understanding the voice of GOD saying in the Gospel, 'Without Me ye can do nothing;'<sup>c</sup> and that of the Apostle, 'Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of GOD.'"<sup>d</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Rom. vii. 9.—*Contra Celsum*,  
Lib. iii. p. 154.

• S. John xv. 5

<sup>d</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 5.—*Conc. Arausican.*  
ii. Canon 7. *ap. Labbe. Tom. IV.*  
p. 1668.

## CHAPTER XIII.

OF THE PREPARATION FOR THE COMING OF CHRIST BY THE  
LAW OF NATURE AND THE LAW OF MOSES.

Of the  
Divine Eco-  
nomy in the  
plan of  
Man's Re-  
demption by  
CHRIST.

§. 1. "WHEN Man had been taken by this assault of the Devil who originated evil, and had not kept the commandment of his Creator, and had been denuded of grace, and had stripped off his confidence towards GOD, and been covered with the roughness of a naughty life (for this is what the fig-leaves indicate,) and been clad with mortification, to wit, the mortality and coarse nature of the flesh (for this is the clothing of dead skins,) and been banished from Paradise by GOD's just judgment and been condemned to death and made subject to corruption, the compassionate GOD Who had given him being did not overlook him. But having first instructed him by many means and called him to repentance by groaning and trembling, by the deluge of water and within a little the entire destruction of all mankind, by the confusion and distinction of languages, by presidency of angels, by conflagration of cities, by typical Divine appearances, by wars, victories, defeats, by signs and wonders and various powers, by the Law, by Prophets; by means whereof the thing studied was the taking away of sin that had variously spread and had enslaved Man and heaped all kind of mischief on his life, as well as the return of Man to well-being, since by sin death had entered into the world as a wild beast wasting human life: but it was necessary, that he that should redeem man should be sinless and not subject to death through sin; and besides, GOD would have Man be strengthened and renewed in his nature, and taught in the way of virtue that leadeth to life eternal; finally, He exhibits the great ocean of His love to

**Man.** For He Himself the Creator and LORD undertakes the struggle on behalf of His own work, and in truth becomes his teacher. And whereas the Enemy baits Man with the hope of divinity, he is taken himself by the bait of flesh ; and at the same time is shown the goodness and the wisdom, the justice and the power of GOD. His goodness, in that He overlooked not the infirmity of His own work, but had compassion on it when it fell and stretched out His hand : His justice, in that, when Man had been vanquished, He made not another to vanquish the tyrant nor snatched Man from death by force ; but whom Death of old enslaved by sin, him GOD again made victorious, and saved like by like, which was the difficulty. GOD's wisdom is shown, in that He found a most fitting solution of the difficulty. For by the good pleasure of the FATHER, the Only Begotten Son and WORD of GOD, who is in the bosom of the FATHER, co-essential with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST, Who was in the beginning with GOD and was in the form of GOD, having bowed the heavens came down by an inconceivable condescension, and being perfect GOD became perfect Man, and accomplished the only new thing under the sun, whereby the boundless power of GOD is declared. For what is greater than for GOD to become Man ? And the WORD unchangeably became flesh, of the HOLY GHOST and Mary the Holy ever-Virgin and Mother of GOD. And the Alone Merciful is called Mediator between GOD and men,\* having been conceived in the immaculate womb of the Virgin, not of the will or desire or connection of man, but of the HOLY GHOST and the first birth of Adam. And He became subject to His FATHER, healing our transgression by the assumption of our nature, and becoming to us a limit of obedience, outside of which salvation is impossible.” †

§. 2. Such is the description given by Damascene, of the *economy* or dispensation of GOD in the recovery of Mankind from the corruption and death induced by Adam to the life and immortality which is purchased by the obedience and

Of the Law  
of Nature,  
or Natural  
Religion.

\* “Nunc vero ita inter Deum et homines mediator apparuit, ut in unitate personæ copulans utramque naturam et solita sublimaret inso-

litis et insolita solitis temperaret.”  
S. Aug. Ep. 137, Tom. II. p. 405.

† S. Joan. Damasc. De Orthod. Fide, cap. 48.



satisfaction of CHRIST. But it would be an error to suppose that, during the ages that elapsed between the Fall of Man and the Reconciliation wrought by CHRIST, GOD left Himself without witness among the nations of the earth: "Who in times past," says S. Paul, "suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."<sup>a</sup> Even further, the will of GOD, which was republished authoritatively in the Law given to Moses, was yet virtually contained (so far as relates to its moral precepts) in the witness of conscience and the promptings of reason. "For," as the same Apostle writes, "when the Gentiles, which have not the Law, do *by nature* the things contained in the Law, these, having not the Law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another."<sup>b</sup> This law of Nature, which is the original law of GOD, continues still the rule of men's actions, and is not abrogated by the publishing of the Gospel; which may be called a new law, as proposing new terms of salvation to all mankind, and as enlarged by positive precepts, (as of Baptism,) set forth as necessary to salvation. (Thornd. *Of the Cov. of Gr.* c. xxix. §. 10.) "GOD did not, as it were waking from a long sleep," (such is the language of Origen), "send JESUS to mankind, Who for reasonable causes hath at this time been allotted the dispensation of the Incarnation, but Who at all times benefited mankind. For no good thing hath taken place among men, without the Divine WORD's having dwelt in souls that were enabled even for a short time to receive such and such operations of the Same."<sup>c</sup> Again: "There is not a timewhen GOD willed not to render righteous the life of men; but He also at all times provided for it, giving starting-points of virtue, for the purpose of correcting the rational animal; and 'in all ages entering into holy souls, He maketh them friends of GOD and prophets.'"<sup>d</sup> Nor

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiv. 16, 17.

<sup>b</sup> Rom. ii. 14, 15.

<sup>c</sup> Contra Celsum, Lib. vi. p. 339.

<sup>d</sup> Wisd. vii. 27.—Contra Cels. L. iii. p. 171.

should it be forgotten, that in His visitations to the holy men of old in bodily shape, as of angels, and in visions, the WORD managed the same as preludes to His incarnation.

This education of Man by means of the Law of Nature may be shown further by two considerations; first, the Law of Moses is distinguished from the Law of Nature, not as though it were altogether alien from it, but as though superadding something to it. For as grace presupposes nature, so it behoves that the Divine Law should presuppose the Law of Nature. Secondly, the reason of man could not err universally about moral precepts, as far as relates to the very commonest precepts of the law of nature; but yet by reason of the habit of sinning it was obscured in particulars. But about such moral precepts as are conclusions drawn from the common principles of the law of nature, the reason of many went astray, so that it judged things lawful which are in themselves evil; whence it was necessary that man should be helped against either defect by the authority of the Divine Law.<sup>k</sup>

§. 3. Man was for a long period entrusted to the government of his own reason without the assistance of written Law, that he might learn by experience the deficiency of his reason from the fact, that men about the time of Abraham fell into idolatry and the foulest sins; and therefore after that time it was necessary that a written law should be given to remedy human ignorance. Before Man might plead ignorance; but on his being instructed by the Law, his pride was convicted of infirmity, when he could not fulfil that which he knew. And therefore "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, GOD sending His own SON in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us."<sup>l</sup> The Law then, which was given to Moses, manifested the precepts of the Law of Nature, when that Law began to be obscured by the abounding of sins; and superadded certain

Of the Law of Moses, and its peculiar obligations.

<sup>k</sup> S. Tho. Summa. I. 2dæ, qu. 99. art. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Rom viii. 3, 4. S. Tho. Summa, I. 2dæ, qu. 98. art. 6.

precepts of its own. As far then as relates to those things which the old Law contained of the Law of Nature, all were held to its observance, not because they belonged to it, but to the Law of Nature : but as far as relates to that which the old Law superadded, none were held to the observance of it save the people of Israel only. And the reason of this is, because the old Law was given to the people of Israel for a certain prerogative of holiness out of reverence to CHRIST, Who was to be born of that people.<sup>m</sup> Now the Law even in its most solemn portion rewards obedience with fulness of days in the good land of Promise, not with Heaven, as may be inferred from Deuteronomy, "Understand therefore, that the LORD thy GOD giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness ; for thou art a stiff-necked people : " and the reason is prefixed, "that the LORD thy GOD may perform the word which the LORD swore unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."<sup>n</sup> So that to resolve what spiritual sense the Law conveyed to pious Israelites, we are to refer to the promises made to the Patriarchs, to the interpretations supplied by the Prophets, not to the *letter* of the Law ; and the sense it is to carry with Christians is to be valued by the correspondence of the Old and New Testaments in the matter of each precept. GOD then gave the Law and other special benefits to that people on account of the promise made to their fathers, that of them CHRIST should be born. Neither also was it on account of the merit of Abraham himself, that a promise was made to him, that CHRIST should be born of his seed ; but of the gratuitous election and calling of GOD ; whence it is said, "Who raised up the righteous man from the east, called him to His foot, gave the nations before him, and made him rule over kings."<sup>o</sup> Thus then it is evident that the fathers received the promise of sole gratuitous election, and the people begotten of them received the Law, as it is said ; "And because He loved thy fathers, therefore He chose their seed after them."<sup>p</sup> If it be again inquired, wherefore He chose this people and none other, that CHRIST should be born of it, the answer of Augustine will meet the

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid.* art. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Deut. ix. 6, 5.

<sup>o</sup> Isa. xli. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Deut. iv. 37.

question; "Why He should draw this man and not that, judge not, if thou wouldst not err." <sup>a</sup>

§. 4. The precepts of the Law of Moses are divided by Aquinas into three classes, whereof the Moral are dictated by the Law of Nature, the Ceremonial are limitations or determinations of Divine worship, and the Judicial are determinations of justice to be observed among men; and he professes to trace these distinctions in the Apostle's language, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."<sup>r</sup> Now the object of this treatise being to exhibit the Divine Economy in matters of Faith, we are not concerned with the province of Moral Theology, but must confine our attention to the bearings of the Mosaic Law on the full development of the Gospel or Catholic Theology. The object then of the Divine Law being to regulate men towards GOD, it may be observed that men are ordered towards GOD not only by inward mental acts such as believing, hoping, loving; but also by certain outward works, whereby men profess Divine service.<sup>s</sup> Of these outward declarations of duty to GOD the chief were Sacrifices and Sacraments. And two reasons may be assigned for their institution: the one literal, according to which they were ordained with a view to GOD's worship; the other figurative or mystical, which has reference to CHRIST. It belongs to the right ordering of the mind towards GOD, that a man should acknowledge the possession of all that he hath from GOD as from the First Principle, and should order them towards GOD as to an ultimate end. And this was represented in oblations and sacrifices, according to which Man offered them in honour of GOD of his own property, as if in recognition that he had it from GOD; as David saith, "All things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee."<sup>t</sup> But, seeing that the institution of sacrifices and of outward Divine worship preceded the Mosaic Law and bore undoubted reference to Man's purification from sin through sorrow and death, and his consequent reconciliation with GOD, the key to unlock the mystery of the Law must be sought in the

Of the Ceremonial Law as typical of CHRIST.

<sup>a</sup> S. Tho. Summa, *ubi supra*, qu. 99. art. 4.  
<sup>r</sup> Rom. vii. 12.—S. Tho. Summ.

qu. 99. art. 4.  
<sup>s</sup> *Ib.* art. 3.

<sup>t</sup> 1 Chron. xxix. 14.

fact, that the sacrifices ordained by it prefigured the crowning bounty and stupendous act of love, whereby that reconciliation was to be effected; in that "CHRIST hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a sweetsmelling savour." \* For this reason all other sacrifices were offered in the old Law, to prefigure this One singular and chief Sacrifice, as the perfect through the imperfect: as the Apostle saith, "And every Priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of GOD." † S. Augustine teaches this view of the Old Law as a preparation for CHRIST; "Not only the prophecies and moral precepts, but even the sacred rites, the priesthood, tabernacle or temple, altars, sacrifices, ceremonies, feast days, and whatever else belongs to that service which is due to GOD and is properly called in Greek *Latreia*, signified and foretold those things, which for the sake of the eternal life of believers in CHRIST we both believe to have been fulfilled, and see in course of fulfilment, and trust will be fulfilled." ‡ Again: "This is the mystery (*sacramentum*) of the Old Testament, where the New was hidden, that there the promises and gifts were earthly; spiritual men even then understanding, although not yet clearly proclaiming, both what eternity was signified by those temporal things, and in what gifts of GOD lay true felicity." §

\* Eph. v. 2.

† Heo. x. 11, 12. *μὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσιᾶν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, as I conceive, most clearly refers to the Sacrifice of the Cross, as perpetual in its effects, and especially in the solemn representation thereof in the Eucharist, which is the very Sacrament of the Atonement, and perpetually exhibited as long as sin may be expiated and until the Elect have been gathered in to their FATHER's kingdom. Dr. Burton (*in loco*) adopts the above reading of *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* in connection with *προσενέγκας* on the authority of Bos and Valckenaer; I follow it, because of its harmony with the consentient tradition of the Catholic

Church, and with the fourteenth verse of the same chapter, *μὴ γὰρ προσφορὰν τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους*. See also Whitby *in loco*.—S. Tho. Summa, I. 2dæ, qu. 102, art. 3.

‡ S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, Lib. vii. c. 32.

§ *Ib.* Lib. iv. c. 33.—As a specimen of the ingenious diligence, with which the Schoolmen are wont to follow these analogies in detail, I append the following from Aquinas: "Causa figuralis (hujus rei, nempe, de terræ nascentibus diversimode fiebat oblatio) est, quia panis significat Christum, qui est panis vivus, ut dicitur Johann. 6. Qui quidem erat sicut in spica pro statu

§. 5. "By the redemption (wrought by this mystery)," says Pope Gelasius, "prepared by eternal Providence before the beginning of the world, whether before the publication of the Law, or under its observance, the old stock (of Adam) was purified by the figurative seals and sacrifices of holy men and women; and the remedy of eternal salvation befell all righteous persons through the SPIRIT of Grace by this mystery adored afar off; the fulness whereof manifested in CHRIST to the Gentiles purifies and renews the world, and truly makes us to be partakers of perpetual blessedness." In the Profession of Faith exacted from Lucidus a presbyter by the Council of Arles (A.D. 475,) he says, (and its importance is derived from its being a satisfaction made to the Church); "I assert also that by reason and the order of ages some have been saved by the law of grace, others by the law of Moses, others by the law of nature, which GOD hath written in the hearts of all, in the hope of CHRIST'S coming: yet from the beginning of the world they have not been absolved from the original bond unless by the intercession of the Sacred Blood." Lucidus probably meant the patriarchs before Moses by those "saved by the law of nature;" but I venture to extend the term to those who, though involved in erroneous systems of religion, (such as the ancient Chinese, the purer Buddhists, Platonists, &c.,) yet obey the original law of conscience, saving always 'the intercession of the Sacred Blood.' Without the account of CHRIST'S meritorious obedience in His life and death, we Christians cannot admit the possibility of salvation. If we hold otherwise, we cannot justify Christianity against Judaism; and in pretending it necessary, while denying the Divinity and redeeming work of CHRIST, the Socinian is convicted of an absurdity. Nor shall I concern myself *how* or *when* GOD may show mercy to him who doth the best according to circumstances. S. Francis Xavier told

Distinctions  
of Justifica-  
tion and  
Grace under  
the Old and  
New Law.

legis naturæ in fide patrum, erat autem sicut simila in doctrina legis et prophetarum. Erat autem sicut panis formatus post humanitatem assumptam; coctus igne, id est, formatus Spiritu Sancto in clibano uteri Virginalis; qui etiam fuit coctus in

sartagine per labores quos in mundo sustinebat, in cruce vero quasi in craticula adustus." Summa, I. 2dæ qu. 102. art. 4. *ad* 12.

\* Gelasii P. P. I. Ep. vii. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1180.

\* *Ibid.* p. 1045.

the Japanese, that, if their ancestors had well used the light of Nature, God would have given them the grace necessary to their salvation. (Leibniz, *Théodicée*, Pt. I. §. 95.) But I will insist on the importance, in this connection, of the ancient interpretation of the passage in 1 S. Peter, c. 3, of CHRIST's preaching to the spirits in prison.

The difference then between the Old and New Law is that of an imperfect and perfect revelation of GOD's grace. "For by the Law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of GOD without the Law is manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets."<sup>a</sup> That is, as the Council of Milevis (A.D. 416,) argues, "When he says, 'is manifested,' he shows that grace was even at the period of the Law, but like the rain which Gideon obtained; then hidden as it were in the fleece, but now manifest on the threshing-floor."<sup>b</sup> But "because the mystery of CHRIST's Incarnation and Passion had not yet been really accomplished, the ceremonies of the Old Law could not truly contain in themselves the virtue flowing from CHRIST as incarnate and having suffered, as the sacraments of the New Law do contain; and therefore they could not purify from sin, as the Apostle saith, 'It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.'<sup>c</sup> And this is the reason why he calls them 'weak and beggarly elements;'<sup>d</sup> weak indeed, because they cannot cleanse from sin; but this weakness proceeded from that they are beggarly, that is, because they do not contain grace in them. But the mind of the faithful could in the time of the Law be joined through faith to CHRIST as incarnate and having suffered, and so they were justified by the faith of CHRIST; of which faith the observance of ceremonies of this sort (so far as they were a figure of CHRIST) was a certain protestation: and therefore certain sacrifices were offered for sins in the old Law, not because the sacrifices themselves purified from sin, but because they were certain protestations of the faith which did purify from sin. And this even the Law itself implies from its manner of speaking. For it is

<sup>a</sup> Rom. iii. 20, 21.

<sup>c</sup> Heb. x. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Conc. Milevitan. ii. *ap.* Labbe.

<sup>d</sup> Gal. iv. 9.

Tom. II. p. 1551.

said that in the oblation of sin-offerings the priest shall pray for him and it shall be forgiven him ; \* as though the sin were forgiven, not from the efficacy of the sacrifices, but from the faith and devotion of the offerers.” †

We seek then for another distinction between the Old and New Law in the fuller gift bestowed on Christians by the sacramental indwelling of CHRIST and their union with Him by participation in a common nature. Thus, (to quote the words of a follower of the Synod of Chalcedon,) “as a bar of iron becomes ignited and is not held without iron tongs ; so too the WORD Which was in the beginning could not have been held and become the life of men, unless He had put on flesh, that in that body He might be held according to the similitude. For He could not be held without a human body, as Isaiah too held not the coal of fire with fingers of flesh, since the WORD of GOD was not yet clad with flesh. For how shall they be able to show from Adam’s creation until CHRIST took flesh of the Virgin Mary, that any of the Elect was able to hold the WORD, Who is before the morning-star, as many now feed on Him ? Did not GOD love those of that generation, as He loves now ? He loved them, and delighted greatly in them. But as a wise baker leavens a mass of dough, and does not directly mingle it with leaven, but rests a while, and then taking leaven mingles it, and so gives his friends to eat : thus was it done in the present instance.” ‡

\* Lev. iv. 35 ; v. 18. S. Thomas followed the Vulgate reading of *rogabit* and *orabit*, where the Septuagint has *ἐξήλθομαι*, and the Authorised English Version ‘shall make an atonement for him.’

† S. Tho. Summa, I. 2dæ, qu. 103, art. 2.

‡ Epist. Varadati ad Leonem Imp. *ad calcem* Conc. Chalcedonensis, *ap. Labbe*, Tom. IV. p. 978. Didymus also unequivocally asserts the operation of the HOLY GHOST in the hearts of believers before as well as after CHRIST ; although I think his statement should be accepted with the limitations above proposed. “Nam et superius prælocuti sumus, in omnibus Sanctis,

tam his qui post adventum Domini nostri fuerunt, quam etiam retro, in patriarchis videlicet et prophetis, Spiritus Sancti gratiam fuisse versatam, et eos diversis charismatibus virtutibusque compleasse. Quomodo enim Unius Dei et Unigeniti Ejus gratiam possidentes, tam hi qui ante quam etiam illi qui post adventum Ejus justitiæ erexere vexillum, veritatis sunt scientiam consecuti ; sic et Spiritus Sancti gratiam possidebant.” (Didym. De Spiritu Sancto, Lib. ii. *ap. S. Hieron. T. VI.* p. 229.) S. Augustine also points out the identity, with the partial distinctions, of the Old and New Covenants : “Dispensabant ergo illi Sancti pro congruentia temporis Testamentum



Possible  
salvation  
of pious  
heathen.

§. 6. The possible salvation of pious heathen under the law of nature, (yet ever by mediation of the CHRIST,) hath engaged the interest of Christians in every age. Not only Alexandrian Fathers favoured the notion, but S. Gregory the Great was persuaded of the salvation of *Trajan* and S. Cadoc of *Vergil's*. (See *Sanct. Catholicum*, p. 51.) The Jews too say that the soul of the emperor *Antoninus Pius* was saved by the prayers of Rabbi *Jehuda the Holy*. (*Talmud*, *Abodah Zarah*, cited by R. Simeon Singer in 'the Homilist.') Erasmus could hardly refrain from an 'Ora pro nobis,' when he thought of *Sokrates*. The Jesuits in China maintained there was no idolatry or atheism in the teaching of *Confucius*. (Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*, IV. c. 18.) Bishop Fowler "would not for a world pronounce all the heathen damned." Leibniz declares in favour of the Jesuits on this head. (*Opp.* p. 725.) The unwisdom of another course is shown by the story of *Radbod* king of the Frisians, who on being told of the positive damnation of his heathen ancestors withdrew from baptism. (Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. II. p. 76.) Guy Tachard, a Jesuit missionary in Siam in 1687, says that the bearing of the Buddhist priests at their prayers made him feel "more than all the sermons and spiritual books" the humility due before GOD in church or in private. Subdued passions and features "placid as the sky above them" were theirs, in the eyes of an English officer in 1834. (*Asiatic Journal of Bengal*, IV. 32.)

This is preferable to the bigotry of Sir Thomas Herbert, (Charles I.'s faithful attendant;) who in 1627 admits that they taught the people to love one another and forbear bloodshedding, yet pronounces their chaunts "sweete musique to the Deuill, thereby to delight his melancholy." (*Travels*, p. 196). If the Koran holds out hope to 'virtuous Jews and Christians,' and even to all 'who practise virtue and believe in One GOD and the life to come,' I trust the benevolence of the Gospel will not be found narrower. (Pp. 58, 72. Lisbon, 1861.)

vetus, pertinebant vero ad novum. Nam et quando temporalem felicitatem agebant, æternam veram et præferendam intelligebant, et istam

ministrabant in mysterio, ut illum consequerentur in præmio." (S. Aug. De Gratia Novi Testamenti *scu* Ep. 140, Tom. II. p. 423.)

What Christian of mental culture, who possesses a human heart, but must blush to claim Heaven as the home of baptized worldlings, who palpably fall short of the moral elevation of so many who on earth have not known the CHRIST? Divines have all, more or less, sat at the feet of Aristotle or of Plato; moralists have learnt the lessons of M. Tullius and Epictetus; sovereigns might reverence their superiors in the two Antonines; we all have drank in noble sentiments from the fountains of Homer and Vergil.

Can we doubt that the Father of lights will recover these choice vessels through His incarnate Wisdom? And, if I may thus introduce the following chapter, the dwelling of the WORD in our nature is the response of GOD, in Himself unapproachable, to the need of "the soul petrified by the sentiment of the infinite," as Mark Pattison writes of himself. (*Letter to M. Edmond Scherer in the Times*, June 2, 1885.) Grant that this hope is 'without warrant of GOD's law' and only 'a presumption of what may be,' if it be not of faith, it is, I trust, of hope and charity. "Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O LORD GOD, thou knowest." (Ezekiel xxxvii. 3.)

§. 7. Two circumstances deserve to be noticed in connection with the Divine Preparation for CHRIST'S Coming, which, though of an historical rather than of a theological character, are yet too remarkable in the way of collateral evidence of design to be lightly passed over. The first is the important place assigned to Oracles in the heathen world, and the fact of their cessation about the period of our SAVIOUR'S Coming. For no less grave a writer than Dr. Jackson maintains "from the joint authority of all ancient writers, as well profane as sacred, that GOD in former times had spoken unto the world by dreams, visions, oracles, priests, and prophets; and that such revelations had been, amongst the Israelites, as the stars or night-lamps; amongst the heathen as meteors, fiery apparitions, or wandering comets, for their direction in the time of darkness and ignorance." But now that it is an acknowledged fact, "that all the former twinkling lights are vanished, the reason of this alteration men might seek by natural causes, as Plutarch did; but this doubt is cleared,

Of the  
cessation of  
Oracles and  
Prophecies.

and the question truly resolved by (the) Apostle in these words, 'At sundry times and in divers manners GOD spake in the old time to our Fathers by the Prophets; in these last days He hath spoken unto us by His SON, Whom He hath made heir of all things, by Whom also He made the world': Who, being the brightness of His glory, hath put the former lights, which shined in darkness, to flight."<sup>a</sup>

The second circumstance is, the cessation of miracles, of oracles, and of prophecies, even among GOD'S chosen people, antecedently to the same event. Jackson notes "the religious sobriety of the later writers of the Bible or other godly men, who have written of Jews' affairs; not one of them since Hezekiah's time relating such wonders as their fathers had told them, as a proof, "that the former miracles were no fictions of human fancy: otherwise the Jews, living between Hezekiah's and CHRIST'S time, would have been copious in their inventions of the like; as we see by experience, that the learned Jews since our SAVIOUR'S time have been most ridiculously apish in coining, and the illiterate as gross in believing, most absurd and filthy fables. That this people, during the whole time of the second temple, added no books to the Canon of the Bible, confirms their forefathers' care of admitting none in former times, but upon evident and sure experiments of their Divine authority. Again, it was most miraculous, that this people, which had prophets and sacred writers in every age before the Babylonish Captivity, should after their redemption thence lie so quiet, that not the most learned among them did ever challenge the name of Prophet; though they had men of divine spirits and excellent observation in heavenly matters, as appears by the Author of Ecclesiasticus, the Book of Wisdom, and other books of good use amongst all religious men, though not canonical amongst the Jews themselves. \* \* The reason of all which I have given before. GOD had enjoined a general silence throughout this land, that all might hearken more attentively unto the crier's voice appointed to prepare the way of the LORD."<sup>i</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Jackson's Works, Vol. I. p. 37,  
Bk i. ch. 10.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* c. 17, p. 66.

## CHAPTER XIV.

## OF THE INCARNATION OF THE WORD OR SON OF GOD.

§. 1. THE Incarnation or the great mystery, wherein GOD the SON "came down from heaven, and was incarnate (for us) by the HOLY GHOST of the Virgin Mary, and was made man,"<sup>j</sup> is clearly set forth in the following passages of Scripture. "The HOLY GHOST shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the SON of GOD."<sup>k</sup> "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the FATHER,) full of grace and truth."<sup>l</sup> "But when the fulness of the time was come, GOD sent forth His SON, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."<sup>m</sup> "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."<sup>n</sup> It was to be expected, that, when this central doctrine of the Gospel came to be presented to the acceptance of men, it would receive accretions of error according to the previous bias and prejudice of classes and schools of opinion. Thus, while the ordinary Jewish mind associated the idea of the MESSIAH with the secular glory of David and Solomon, and when that illusion vanished would still be apt to fall back

Statement  
of the Doc-  
trine, and of  
the heresies  
opposed  
to it.

<sup>j</sup> Nicene Creed.

<sup>k</sup> S. Luke i. 35.

<sup>l</sup> S. John i. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Gal. iv. 4, 5.

<sup>n</sup> Heb. ii. 14, 15.

on some example of heroic suffering in the records of their past history, such as Elias and Jeremias, to furnish a parallel to the Man of Sorrows; on the other hand, a disciple, imbued with the mysticism of Buddha, or bent on idealising human nature with whatever help from Platonic theories, would be tempted to dismiss the fact of the real humanity of CHRIST as trenching on the majesty of His Godhead. The two great divisions of heterodox statements respecting the Incarnation, the Nestorian and Eutychian, are traceable accordingly, the first through Paul of Samosata to the Jewish Ebionites, the second through Apollinarius of Laodicæa to the Eastern heresy of Manes. Paul held that CHRIST was bare Man, and that the Divine LOGOS dwelt in him as He had done in the old Prophets; so that there were two natures in CHRIST, separated from each other and with no intercommunication, insomuch that CHRIST was one, the indwelling WORD another.\* His theological successors, whether Theodore of Mopsuestia or Nestorius, affecting to maintain Catholic language but in a non-natural sense, stated the union of GOD the WORD with Man, but qualified the admission by representing it to be according to grace or operation or dignity or relation or power. For, calling the LOGOS JESUS and CHRIST, and naming the Man separately CHRIST and SON, and evidently mentioning two persons, they professed to acknowledge one Person and one CHRIST according to appellation only and honour and dignity and worship. But they did not confess the union of God the WORD with flesh endowed with a rational and intellectual soul to have been a person (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*), as the holy Fathers taught: and for this reason, that His Person (or Hypostasis) was One, which is the LORD JESUS CHRIST, One of the HOLY TRINITY.<sup>p</sup> Theodore indeed appears to have anticipated Socinian error, when he is reported to have held that CHRIST, having obtained GOD's grace in the way of growth and proficiency, is thence named GOD: that He was first endowed with the Spirit at His baptism in Jordan; and that the LOGOS after His own good pleasure dwelt in Him on account of His excellent virtue, and imparted to Him of His own

\* Geo. Cedreni Historiarum Compendium, p. 260.

<sup>p</sup> Conc. Constant. ii. Œcumen. v. Canon. 4; *ap.* Labbe. Tom. V. p. 569.

Divine dignity, and caused Him to be adored after death.<sup>a</sup> On the other hand, Manes, as well as the early Docetæ, reduced the humanity of CHRIST to a mere phantom or apparition. The Arians held that the inferior Divinity of the LOGOS animated the body of CHRIST instead of a soul. Apollinarius of Laodicæa, while he admitted that the flesh of CHRIST was animated by a vegetative soul, denied that it needed the direction of a human intellect; for, being possessed by the Divine LOGOS, it admitted not an intellective power beside the Divine. Eutyches again carried on the process of refining, and, denying that CHRIST is consubstantial with us as touching His flesh, asserted that His Body was of heavenly origin and passed through the Virgin's womb as water through a pure channel; or, again varying his statement, that before their union CHRIST had two natures, but after the union they became one.\*

Against these erroneous statements the Catholic Church has pronounced expressly, "If any one saith that the GOD Who wrought miracles is one and the CHRIST Who suffered another, or that GOD the WORD was with the CHRIST that was made of a woman, or was in Him as one in another, but doth not say that our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the WORD of GOD, that was made flesh, is one and the same, and that the miracles and sufferings which He voluntarily underwent in the flesh are those of the same Person; let him be anathema."<sup>a</sup> "For the union (of natures) being understood in a various sense, they who follow the impiety of Apollinarius and Eutyches, being inclined to the obliteration of the natures which met, proclaim the union to be in the way of confusing or blending (*κατὰ σύγχυσιν*); but those of Theodore's and Nestorius's sentiments, affecting the division (of the natures), introduce a relative union. The holy Church of GOD however, rejecting the impiety of either heresy, confesses the union of GOD the WORD with the flesh to be a personal union (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*). For the personal union in the mystery of CHRIST not only preserves the subjects that met unconfused but also admits not

<sup>a</sup> Cedrenus, p. 261.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 262. Liberati Brevi-  
arium, cap. 11.

<sup>c</sup> Conc. C. P. ii. Œcumenic. V.  
canon. iii. *ap.* Labbe. T. V. p. 569.

division.”<sup>†</sup> “In saying that the Only-Begotten WORD was personally united (to the flesh), we do not assert any mutual confusion (ἀνάχυσιν τινα τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλους) of the natures to have been effected, but rather we understand the WORD to have been united to the flesh, either nature remaining what it is. Wherefore One is the CHRIST, GOD and Man, the same consubstantial with the FATHER according to His Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to His Manhood; for the Church of GOD rejects and anathematizes equally both those that divide or cut up in portions and those that confound the mystery of the Divine economy in CHRIST.”<sup>‡</sup> This *Hypostatic* or Substantial or Personal Union of Natures in CHRIST is confessed in the course of the Eucharistic Rite in many Eastern Liturgies, dating after the Council of Chalcedon; as in the Alexandrian Orthodox or Melchite Liturgy of S. Basil, where the Priest saith; “I believe truly, that His Divinity was never separated from His Humanity for a moment or in the twinkling of an eye.”<sup>§</sup> And in the Syro-Jacobite Liturgy of S. James, the Priest, putting a particle of the consecrated Bread into the Chalice, is directed to say; “Thou didst mingle, LORD, Thy Divinity with our humanity, and our humanity with Thy Divinity; Thy Life with our mortality, and our mortality with Thy Life; Thou didst receive what was ours and gavest us Thine own, for the life and salvation of our souls; to Thee be glory for evermore.”<sup>||</sup> The Council of Chalcedon anathematized “every man that separates from the Divinity the flesh of our LORD and GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, which He united to Himself of the holy Virgin Mary the Mother of GOD, and that mentions not His Divine and Human properties without confusion, varying, or division.”<sup>¶</sup>

§. 2. From the habit of contemplating this union of Natures in the one Person of CHRIST arose a mode of expression, which is highly dangerous to the verity of their continued and unconfused existence, unless proper safeguards be adopted. I mean especially the language frequently found in the

Of the participation of the Divine Nature by the Manhood of CHRIST.

<sup>†</sup> *Ibid.* canon. iv.

<sup>‡</sup> *Ib.* canon viii.

<sup>§</sup> Benaudot. Liturg. Oriental. Tom. I. p. 83. See also the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil, *Ibid.* p. 24.

<sup>||</sup> *Ibid.* Tom. II. p. 41.

<sup>¶</sup> ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως. Conc. Chalcedon. Actio iv. ap. Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 492.

Fathers concerning the 'flesh of God,' 'the deification of CHRIST's Body,' and the like. Thus Origen, while in one passage of his work against Celsus he says orthodoxly that GOD the SON came in a human soul and body,<sup>7</sup> in another paves the way for Monophysite error: "He, Whom we think and are persuaded is from the beginning GOD and SON of GOD, is the Ideal WORD (*ὁ ἀντόλογος*) and Ideal Wisdom and Ideal Truth; but His mortal body and the human soul in it we affirm to have received the greatest advantages by their not only communion with Him but also union and mixture; and having partaken of his Divinity to have passed into GOD."<sup>8</sup> But Damascene gives a key to the language, when he asserts that the Flesh of CHRIST was *deified* (*τεθεωσθαι*), "not according to change of nature, or variation, or turning, or confusion, but according to the dispensation, I mean the Personal Unity, by which It was inseparably united to GOD the WORD, and the mutual circumincession of the Natures; even as we speak of the heating of iron. For as we acknowledge the Incarnation to be without change and turning, so also we are of opinion that the deification of the Flesh took place. For neither, because the WORD became flesh, did He depart from the bounds of His proper Godhead nor from the Divine glories belonging to It; nor yet did His Flesh, when deified, turn from its proper nature or from its natural properties: since even after the union the Natures remain unmingled, and their properties unimpaired." He further illustrates the Union by saying, "Iron made red-hot burns, having acquired its burning operation not by reason of its nature but by its union with the fire: the same Flesh therefore was by itself mortal and life-giving because of its Personal Union with the WORD. Likewise we speak of the deification of His will, not as though the natural emotion were changed, but as having been united to His Divine and Almighty Will and become the will of GOD made Man. Whence when He would be hid He could not because of (the will) itself, GOD the WORD having been pleased that the weakness of the human will should be shown to really exist in Him;

<sup>7</sup> Orig. Adv. Celsum, Lib. iii. p. 132.

<sup>8</sup> *εἰς θεὸν μεταβεβηκέναι*. *Ibid.* Lib. iii. p. 140.



but when He would cleanse the leper He effected it, because of the union with the Divine Will." \* Dr. Jackson justifies this language in these words ; " So then the flesh and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST was truly and properly not Divine but human flesh and blood ; and yet withal as truly and properly *Caro Dei* and *Sanguis Dei*, the flesh and blood of GOD, as it was *caro humana*, *sanguis humanus*, human flesh and human blood : more properly the flesh and blood of GOD than the flesh and blood of man. For even the whole humanity of CHRIST, as well the reasonable soul as the flesh, was and is the humanity of the SON of GOD. ' GOD,' saith the Apostle, <sup>b</sup> ' hath purchased the Church τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι, with His own proper blood.' " \*

But it may be objected against this notion of the quickening and Divine character of the Flesh of CHRIST in consequence of its union with the LOGOS, that " the flesh profiteth nothing ; " <sup>d</sup> and, though the consideration of this text comes properly in connection with the doctrine of the Eucharist, I will here anticipate it, and reply with Tertullian ; " Although CHRIST said that the flesh profiteth nothing, the meaning must be governed by the object-matter of the saying. For because they thought His speech hard and intolerable, as if He had truly ordained His flesh to be eaten by them ; that He might dispose the state of salvation (so as to pass) into spirit, He premised, ' It is the spirit that quickeneth ; ' and so subjoined, ' the flesh profiteth nothing,' to wit, towards quickening. He also pursues what He would have understood as spirit ; ' The words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life ; ' as also above, ' He that heareth My Word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation ; but is passed from death unto life.' \* And so making His Word to be life-giving because the Word is spirit and life, He also called the same His flesh ; because the WORD too was made flesh ; therefore to be sought for as a cause of life, and to be eaten by hearing, masticated by the understanding,

\* S. Jo. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, cap. 64, p. 89.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xx. 28.

\* Works, vol. ii. p. 716.—We find the expression in Tertullian ; " Quid

infirmum Dei, fortius homine, nisi nativitas et caro Dei ? " (Adv. Marcion. Lib. v. c. 5, p. 467.)

<sup>d</sup> S. John vi. 63.

\* S. John v. 24.

and digested by faith. For a short while before He had pronounced His flesh to be heavenly bread; all along by the allegory of His people urging the memby of their fathers, who had preferred the bread and flesh-meat of Egypt to the Divine calling. Therefore adverting to their reflections, because He felt they were to be dispelled, 'The flesh,' He saith, 'profiteth nothing.'"<sup>f</sup>

§. 3. As there is a *circumincersion* and communication of *idioms*, properties, or characteristics in the Blessed TRINITY, so also we perceive the same to obtain in the Person of the Incarnate WORD; saving always, when for the purposes of thought we abstract the account of His two Natures as they are in themselves, antecedently to their union in the one Person of CHRIST. For, as Nazianzen observes, "He that is now Man, was also incomposite. What He was He continued to be, and what He was not He assumed."<sup>g</sup> This communication of *idioms* is largely handled in the Liturgies and Fathers from the time of Nestorius downwards; nowhere more clearly and eloquently than in the following words of S. Proclus. "He came to save, but it was needful that He should also suffer. How was it possible that either should take place? Mere Man could not save, pure GOD could not suffer. What then? Himself being GOD IMMANUEL, became Man; and What He was saved, What He became suffered. Wherefore when the Church saw the Synagogue crowning Him with thorns, bewailing the outrage, she said, 'Daughters of Jerusalem, go out and behold the crown wherewith His mother crowned Him.'<sup>h</sup> For He both wore the crown of thorns, and loosed the condemnation of thorns. The same was in the bosom of the FATHER and in the Virgin's womb. The same in His Mother's arms and on the wings of the wind. The same was worshipped by angels and sat down with publicans. The Seraphim gazed not on Him, and Pilate questioned Him. The slave smote Him, and creation shuddered. He was nailed on the cross, and the throne of glory was not vacated. He was shut up in a tomb,

Of the communication of *Idioms* in CHRIST.

<sup>f</sup> Tert. De Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 37, p. 347.

<sup>g</sup> S. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 35. Tom. I. p. 575.

<sup>h</sup> Canticles iii. 11.

and He stretched out the heaven like a curtain. He was reckoned among the dead, and He despoiled Hell. Here He was traduced as a deceiver, and there He was glorified as holy. O the mystery! I see the miracles, and I proclaim the Godhead. I see the sufferings, and I deny not the Manhood. But IMMANUEL opened the gates of nature as Man, but as GOD He brake not the seal of virginity. As He entered through the ear, so came He out of the womb. As He was conceived, so was He born. He entered impassibly, incorruptibly came He forth; according to the prophet Ezekiel, saying, 'Then He brought me back the way of the gate of the outward sanctuary which looketh towards the east; and it was shut. Then said the LORD unto me; This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the LORD, the GOD of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.'"<sup>1</sup>

This head may be further illustrated by Tertullian's famous paradox; "The SON of GOD was crucified; it is not a matter of shame to us, because it doth occasion shame. The SON of GOD died; it is quite credible, because it is not meet. Being buried He rose again; it is certain, because it is impossible."<sup>2</sup> Again, he writes; "How did the WORD become flesh, was He as it were transfigured in the flesh, or did He put on flesh? Yea, He put on flesh. But we must needs believe GOD to be immutable and informable, as being eternal. Transfiguration however is the doing away with what existed before (*interemptio pristini*). For everything that is transfigured into another ceases to be what it was, and begins to be what it was not. But GOD neither ceases to be, nor can be anything but what He is. And the WORD is GOD; and the WORD of GOD remaineth for ever, to wit, by persevering in His own form. And if He admits not of being transfigured, it follows that He be so understood to have become flesh, while He comes to be in flesh, and is manifested and is seen and is handled through the flesh; because the other incidents also

<sup>1</sup> Ezek. xliv. 1, 2.—S. Procli Homilia, c. 9. *ap.* Labbe, Tom. III. p. 18. Compare the language of S. Leo in his letter to Flavian, c. 4. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 351; and

the *Contestaciones Missæ* in the Gallican Sacramentary, pp. 374, 382.

<sup>2</sup> Tert. De Carne Christi, c. 5, p. 310.

require to be so understood. For if the WORD was made flesh by a transfiguration and change of substance, JESUS will now be one substance made of two, a certain mixture of flesh and spirit, as composite metal (*electrum*) made of gold and silver: and He begins to be neither gold, that is, spirit, nor silver, that is, flesh, while two things are mutually changed, and a third thing is effected. Neither then will JESUS be GOD." \* A vicious extension of the maxim, that the honour due to the principal may be paid to the representative, must be noticed in Aquinas, (*Summa*, P. III. qu. xxv. art. 4.) where he allows *latreia*, Divine worship, to the true Cross. The second Nicene Council in its definition reserves *latreia* as befitting only the Divine Nature; and that, according to our Faith.

§. 4. Thus then the doctrine of the Incarnation involves the employment of language, wherein the terms, proper to either of the two Natures, (as viewed abstractedly by themselves, and antecedently to their union), are yet continually interchanged in consequence of the functions of those two Natures being exercised by One Person, Who is GOD and MAN, CHRIST JESUS. Here however the subtlety of Greek Theology introduces the term *theandric operation* (*θεανδρική ἐνέργεια*) to denote that unity of operation, whereby, although we confess the two Natures and the two Wills of CHRIST to remain even after the Union unmixed and unconfused, the effect of that Union is in some instances such as to blend their operations and to baffle our practical distinction. The Council of Lateran under Pope Martin I. (A.D. 649,) condemns with asperity the 'heretics,' who introduce this novel expression;¹ and the subtle sapping of the doctrine of the

Of the  
Theandric  
operation of  
CHRIST.

\* Tert. adversus Praxeam, c. 27. p. 516. S. Cyril of Alexandria emphatically denies the possibility of an ideal half-way between Divinity and Humanity, of a Being, Who should be absolutely neither GOD nor MAN; ἀδιανόητον παντελῶς τὸ χρημὰ ἐστι. καὶ τόπος ἢ λόγος οὐδεὶς ὁρᾶται μεταξὺ ποιητοῦ καὶ κτίσματος. Conc. Ephes. Part. I. *ap.* Labbe, Tom. III. p. 23. In the Confession of Faith of Leporius, already quoted, the communication of *idioms* is thus expressed: "Confitentes ut-

ramque substantiam carnis et Verbi, unum eumdemque Deum atque hominem inseparabilem pia fidei credulitate suscipimus; et ex tempore susceptæ carnis sic omnia dicimus quæ erant Dei transisse in hominem, ut omnia quæ erant hominis in Deum venirent." Leporii Libellus, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1679. See also S. Leo, Epist. 83, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. III. p. 1380.

¹ τὴν ἐκ' αὐτῇ τῇ θεανδρικῇ καινῇ βῆσιν. Conc. Lateran. Canon. 16, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. VI. p. 353.

Incarnation by the Monothelites may have justified its jealousy. But it may be open to us to applaud the employment of mediating terms in Theology, and to accept the explanation of Damascene: "The *Theandric* operation then signifies this; that, when GOD became Man, both His human operation was Divine, to wit, Deified and participated in His Divine operation, and His Divine operation participated in His human operation, but either is contemplated in connection with the other. And this manner is styled periphrasis, when a person embraces any two things by one expression. For, as we call the divided cauterising and the inflamed incision of a heated knife the same thing, but style the incision one operation and the cauterising another, and call them operations of different natures, the cauterising of fire and the incision of iron; so also, speaking of one theandric operation of CHRIST, we understand the operations of the two Natures to be two, the Divine, that of His Divinity, and the human operation, that of His Humanity."<sup>m</sup>

Of the term  
*Theotokos*  
applied to  
the Blessed  
Virgin  
Mary.

§. 5. An instance, analogous to the *Theandric* operation, may be cited in the peculiar title of *Theotokos* (God's Parent, or Mother of GOD), which ever since the Council of Ephesus the Church has consecrated to denote the incommunicable privilege of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in that she became the Mother of IMMANUEL, GOD-with-us.<sup>n</sup> I do not know on what ground the use of this title can be defended, except on the admission of the principle of the *Theandric* operation, that is to say, that the attributes and essence of the LOGOS may be applied to that human Nature born of Mary, because of their Personal Union in the One CHRIST; and that such interchange is required in order to impress on our minds the reality of the Union (*ἔνωσις*) aforesaid, and that it was not merely a conjunction (*συνάφεια*) or conjugation (*συζυγία*) as

<sup>m</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, c. 66.

<sup>n</sup> The first instance of the use of this term, which I am able to find, in Greek, is in S. Cyril of Jerusalem; "*μαρτυρεῖ πατέρας ἢ Θεοτόκος.*" (Cateches. x. §. 9, p. 133.) The later Greeks employ *Θεομήτωρ* as well. The corresponding Latin terms are *Dei Genitrix* and *Mater*

*Dei*; whereof the latter is found in S. Ambrose; "*Impossibile putatur in Dei Matre, quod in vulturibus possibile non negatur?*" (Hexaëmeron, Lib. v. c. 20.) Tertullian has the substance of it in these words: "*Nasci Se Deus in utero patitur Matris.*" (De Patientia, c. 3, p. 140.)

the Nestorians pretended. Thus, to conceive of Mary's being the Mother of GOD the WORD barely and immediately, so as to involve the notions of priority and causality usually implied in the term 'Mother,' is a blasphemy against the Divinity of the LOGOS: but to acknowledge her to be the Mother of GOD mediately, because "the immutable WORD, being nothing changed for the worse, was rendered partaker of flesh by means of a reasonable soul,"<sup>o</sup> is no blasphemy, but Catholic and Evangelic truth. For, though it is as Man, that CHRIST "is of the substance of His Mother, born in the world;"<sup>p</sup> yet, inasmuch as the WORD "took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin of her substance,"<sup>q</sup> she may truly be styled Mother of GOD, because "two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, *never to be divided*, whereof is One CHRIST, very GOD and very Man." It is this stupendous privilege conferred on Mary, to be the channel of reconciliation between Divinity and Humanity in the Person of the Mediator, that caused the ancient Fathers to overflow in eloquent celebrations, the moment the reality of the Union of the two Natures came to be questioned. Thus, S. Proclus calls Mary "the immaculate repository of virginity, the rational paradise of the Second Adam, the workshop in which was wrought the unity of the two Natures, the celebration of the saving Atonement, the bride-chamber wherein the WORD espoused the flesh, the animate Bush of nature which the fire of the Divine parturition consumed not, the truly light cloud which bore with His Body Him that sitteth upon the Cherubim; the most pure fleece filled with the rain of heaven, with which the Shepherd clad the sheep; the handmaiden and Mother, the only communication of GOD with men; the adorable distaff of the Dispensation, whereon was mysteriously woven the coat of the Incarnation, whereof the weaver was the HOLY SPIRIT, and the spinner the power that overshadowed from on high, and the wool the old skin of Adam, and the woof the immaculate flesh of a virgin, and the shuttle the

<sup>o</sup> "Rationali anima mediante;"  
S. Aug. De Gratia Novi Testamenti,  
§. 12. Tom. II. p. 426.

<sup>p</sup> Athanasian Creed.  
<sup>q</sup> Article II.

immense grace of Him Who wore it, and the artisan the Word that entered by the hearing."<sup>r</sup>

Of the Pre-  
destination  
of the soul  
of JESUS.

§. 6. Another way, in which the reality of the Incarnation was wont to be tested, was the inquiry respecting the predestination and election of the human soul of JESUS. The inquiry is not so idle or impertinent as it may seem to some at first sight; because to refuse to entertain it lays us open to the argument of the Monothelite heresy. Origen's view of the subject is tinged with his notion about the pre-existence of the soul. He begins with stating, that, as the nature of souls universally is endowed with a capacity for good or evil, we cannot doubt but that the soul of JESUS also was so endowed, unless we mean to deny that He had a real human soul. But, granting the existence of such a capacity, he asserts that the soul of JESUS chose to love righteousness, in such wise as to inhere unchangeably in GOD and to effect an inseparable union; so that its assumption was not fortuitous or with acceptance of person, but conferred by merit of its virtues. "Hear," pursues Origen, "the Prophet saying, 'Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity: wherefore GOD, even thy GOD, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.'"<sup>s</sup> By the merit of love then He is anointed with the oil of gladness, that is, the soul of CHRIST is rendered one with the WORD of GOD. For by being anointed with the oil of gladness nothing else is understood than being filled with the HOLY GHOST. But in that he said 'above thy fellows,' he shows that the grace of the SPIRIT was not given It as to the Prophets, but the fulness of the WORD of GOD Himself was in It substantially; as the Apostle also said, 'In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.'<sup>t</sup> Again; "The soul which was in JESUS, before

<sup>r</sup> S. Procli Homil. *ap.* Conc. Ephes. Part. i. Labbe. III. p. 12. So also S. Cyril of Alexandria in his sermon at Ephesus, which he concludes with the words, "γένοιτο δὲ ἡμᾶς—τρέμειν καὶ σέβειν τὴν ἀδιδεσ-  
τατον Τριάδα ὁμνούντες τὴν ἀειπάρθετον  
Μαρίαν, δηλονότι, τὴν ἁγίαν Ἐκκλη-  
σίαν, καὶ τὸν ταύτης Υἱὸν καὶ Νυμφίον  
ἁπλῶν. (*Ibid.* Part. ii. pp. 584,

589.) Tertullian too applies Ps. lxxii. 6, "He shall come down like the rain into a fleece of wool" to the Incarnation; "Placidum descensum Ejus et insensibilem describens de celo in carnem." (Adv. Marcionem, Lib. v. c. 9, p. 472.)

<sup>s</sup> Ps. xlv. 8.

<sup>t</sup> Col. ii. 9. Origen. Peri Archon, Lib. ii. c. 6, p. 441.)

that It knew evil, chose good ; and because It loved righteousness and hated iniquity, GOD anointed It with the oil of gladness above Its fellows. It is anointed then with the oil of gladness, being joined with the WORD of GOD by an immaculate federation : and hereby It alone of all souls was incapable of sin, because It well and fully contained the SON of GOD. And therefore it both is one with Him, and is named by His names, and is styled JESUS CHRIST, by Whom all things are said to have been made.”<sup>u</sup> The Pelagians appear to have followed Origen, in that they made CHRIST to have purchased His Godhead by the actions and behaviour of His human nature, by His mere free will ; and so were involved in the condemnation of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus. How much further Socinus, who dreamed that in consideration of His obedience and acceptance of His mission GOD advanced JESUS to the true power and worship of GOD, though in dependence on Himself, in plain terms, constituted Him *vice*-GOD ; which is heathenism. (*Thorndike*, Bk. II. ch. x. §§. 5, 6.)

But this account labours under the radical defect of attributing the free election and predestination of GOD to the merit of His creature, that is, of the human soul of JESUS. Now as this would be to remove the soul of CHRIST from the nature of human souls, which can have no merit but what proceeds from GOD’S free grace, we conclude with Augustine ; “ He then Who made That Man (CHRIST JESUS), without any His preceding merits, neither to draw from His origin nor by will to commit any sin that should be forgiven Him, Himself maketh them that believe in Him such as to whom He may forgive all sin, without any their preceding merits. He who made Him such as that He never had nor shall have an evil will, Himself maketh in His members of an evil will a good one. Both Him therefore and us hath He predestinated ; because both in Him that He should be our Head, and in us that we should be His Body, He (even GOD) foreknew, not that our merits should precede but that His works should be.”<sup>v</sup> Again : “ The predestination then of the Saints itself is that which chiefly is conspicuous in the Saint of Saints : which who can

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* L. iv. *circ. finem*, p. 474.

<sup>v</sup> S. Arg. De Dono Perseverantiæ, c. 24. Tom. X. p. 858.



deny, of such as rightly understand the words of truth? For we have learnt that the LORD of Glory Himself also was predestinated, in so far as the SON of GOD was made Man. The Teacher of the Gentiles cries at the head of his Epistles; 'Paul, a servant of JESUS CHRIST, called to be an apostle, separated unto the Gospel of GOD (which He had promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures,) concerning His SON JESUS CHRIST our LORD, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the SON of GOD with power,'<sup>w</sup> according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.'<sup>x</sup> JESUS then was predestined, that He Who was to be the Son of David according to the flesh might yet be the SON of GOD in power according to the Spirit of sanctification; because he was born of the HOLY GHOST and of the Virgin Mary. It (namely, His Predestination) is that ineffably wrought and singular taking upon Him of manhood by GOD the WORD, so that He might be truly and properly called at the same time SON of GOD and Son of Man; Son of Man by reason of the assumed manhood, and SON of GOD because of the Only-Begotten GOD Who assumed it; lest not a Trinity but a quaternity be believed. Predestined was that elevation of human nature so great and so high and sublime, that it had not whither it might be more highly exalted; as Divinity Itself had not whither It might depose Itself lower for our sake than the assumption of Man's nature with the infirmity of the flesh even to the death of the cross. As then That One Man was predestined to be our Head, so we many were predestined to be His members. Here let human merits be silent, which have perished through Adam; and let the grace of GOD reign, which reigneth through JESUS CHRIST our LORD, the Only SON of GOD, the One LORD. Whosoever shall find in our

<sup>w</sup> τοῦ ἀρισθέστερος Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, which Augustine renders 'Qui predestinatus est Filius Dei in virtute,' and founds his argument on such rendering. Estius, while accepting Augustine's reading and the argument founded thereupon, as it relates to the Person of CHRIST in His Human Nature, admits that

the Greeks, such as Origen, Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Theophylact, understand S. Paul to be speaking of CHRIST as declared or proved by miracles, ἐν δυνάμει, to be the SON of GOD. See Estius, in Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 7. §. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Rom. i. 1-4.

Head any merits preceding that singular Generation, let him inquire in us His members any merits preceding our multiplied regeneration. For neither was that Generation rendered (*retributa*) to CHRIST but given (*tributa*), that He should be born of the SPIRIT and a Virgin, free from all bond of sin. So also to us was it not rendered for any merit but freely given, to be born again of water and the SPIRIT. And though faith hath brought us to the laver of regeneration, we ought not therefore to think that we first have given aught, so that saving regeneration should be rendered to us; inasmuch as He maketh us to believe in CHRIST, Who for our sakes hath made CHRIST in Whom we believe; He maketh in men the beginning of faith and its perfection in JESUS (*in Jesum*), Who hath made the Man JESUS the author and finisher of our faith.”

§. 7. Having dwelt at such length on the side of the truth, which presents to us the predominating idea of the Godhead in the Person of JESUS, we must not omit to notice that He Himself classes ‘the SON’ with man and the angels of heaven as ignorant of the day and hour of the judgment, a secret reserved to the FATHER alone. (*S. Matt. xxiv. 36.*) Nor that the child JESUS is said to have ‘grown in wisdom’ as well as ‘stature.’ (*S. Luke ii. 52.*) If He was a sharer in our infirmities, if “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,” (*Heb. iv. 15.*) how can we hesitate to admit that He in His human nature was “made subject unto vanity [or weakness,] not willingly,” (*Rom. viii. 20.*) but by reason of the imperfection of the creature? As GOD the WORD, the CHRIST knew that which as Man He knew not. This is a mystery, and must be taken on trust. A mystery ceases to be such, if something remain not inexplicable.

Of the Imperfection of the Human Nature in CHRIST.

’ Heb. xii. 2. S. Aug. De Prædestinatione Sanctorum, cap. 15. Tom. X. p. 810. He elsewhere says; “Ista nativitas profecto gratuita conjunxit in unitate personæ

hominem Deo, carnem Verbo. Istam nativitatem bona opera secuta sunt, non bona opera meruerunt.” De Correptione et Gratia, cap. 11. *Ibid.* p. 767.

## CHAPTER XV.

## OF THE PASSION AND ATONEMENT OF CHRIST.

Statement  
and Scrip-  
ture proof of  
the Atonement.

§. 1. THE mystery of the Gospel consists in the reversal of Adam's disobedience and of the sentence of eternal death incurred thereby, by the obedience of the second Adam, the Man CHRIST JESUS, and by the promise of eternal life to all them that obey Him. But this obedience, though expressed throughout the life of JESUS on earth, found its crowning act and accomplishment in His Death. "But we see JESUS, Who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that He by the grace of GOD should taste death for every man. For it became Him, for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."<sup>a</sup> "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him."<sup>a</sup> "For this purpose the SON of GOD was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil."<sup>b</sup> The works of the devil were sin, which he effected by inducing Adam and Eve to transgress God's commandment, and its consequence, death, which ensued by the withdrawal of God's

<sup>a</sup> Heb. ii. 9, 10, 14, 15.

<sup>a</sup> *Ib.* v. 8, 9.

<sup>b</sup> 1 S. John iii. 8.

favour from the disobedient sinners and their separation from Him, "with Whom is the well of life." The harmony of God's universe having been marred by sin, it was the will of GOD the FATHER, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in CHRIST, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him."<sup>c</sup> "For it pleased the FATHER that in Him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven."<sup>d</sup> "For GOD was in CHRIST, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."<sup>e</sup> "For GOD so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."<sup>f</sup> And S. Paul saith, "But GOD commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, CHRIST died for us." And on this ground of CHRIST's atoning death He builds an argument in favour of our final salvation by reason of His Resurrection and Life: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life."<sup>g</sup> "But this Man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto GOD by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."<sup>h</sup>

This crowning act of CHRIST'S obedience, whereby He "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,"<sup>i</sup> is set forth in Scripture, as the sum and substance of the Gospel, in connection with that Raised Life which set the seal of efficacy to His sufferings. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life."<sup>j</sup> "Ought not CHRIST to have suffered these things, and to enter into His Glory?"<sup>k</sup> And S. Paul

<sup>c</sup> Eph. i. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Col. i. 19, 20.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Cor. v. 19.

<sup>f</sup> S. John iii. 16.

<sup>g</sup> Rom. v. 10.

<sup>h</sup> Heb. vii. 24, 25.

<sup>i</sup> Phil. ii. 8.

<sup>j</sup> S. John iii. 14, 15.

<sup>k</sup> S. Luke xxiv. 26.

blends the two doctrines of the Atonement and Resurrection as a breviary of the Gospel, saying; "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that CHRIST died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."<sup>1</sup> With reference to which verse, Tertullian, arguing for the reality of CHRIST's Flesh from the destructive consequences which would attend its denial, observes in the same strain: "A phantom could not truly suffer. GOD's entire work then has been overthrown. The entire weight and fruit of the Christian name, the Death of CHRIST, is denied, which the Apostle delivers with such stress, to wit, as true; making it the chief foundation of the Gospel and of our salvation and of his preaching."<sup>m</sup> And S. Leo dwells thus on the connection of the Atonement with the reality of the Incarnation; "What hope then do they leave for themselves in the protection of this mystery, who deny the verity of human substance in the SAVIOUR's Body? Let them say by what sacrifice they were reconciled; let them say with what blood He 'hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a sweetsmelling savour?'"<sup>n</sup> Or what sacrifice was ever more consecrated than that which the True High Priest imposed on the Altar of the Cross through the immolation of His own Flesh? For although the death of many saints may have been precious in the sight of the LORD, yet the slaying of no innocent person hath been the propitiation for the world. The righteous have received, not given, crowns; and from the fortitude of the faithful have sprung examples of patience, not gifts of righteousness. Since in each case the deaths were singular, nor did anyone by his own end discharge another's debt; whereas there hath been One alone among the sons of men, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, in Whom all were crucified, all died, all were buried, all were also raised. Of Whom He Himself said; 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me.'"<sup>o</sup> "All have sinned," saith S. Paul, "and come short of the glory of

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.<sup>m</sup> Tert. Adv. Marcionem, Lib. iii. c. 8. p. 401.<sup>n</sup> Eph. v. 2.<sup>o</sup> S. John xii. 32.—S. Leo, Ep. 83. ap. Labbe. Tom. III. p. 1379.

God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in CHRIST JESUS: Whom GOD hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of GOD.”<sup>p</sup> For “as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;” and “as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law” (of Moses) “entered, that the offence might abound.”<sup>q</sup> For by the experience men obtained of their inability to perform the requirements of the Law, the necessity of GOD’S free grace to the saving even of a remnant was fully demonstrated; “that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before GOD;” “to declare at this time His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in JESUS.”<sup>r</sup> Nor was man unable to fulfil its moral precepts only; but its sacrifices and sacraments were not endued with power as channels of forgiveness of sins. “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.”<sup>s</sup> “But CHRIST being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”<sup>t</sup> For we “were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from (the) vain conversation received by tradition from (our) fathers; but

<sup>p</sup> Rom. iii. 23—25.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* v. 12, 18—20.

<sup>r</sup> *Ib.* iii. 19, 26.

<sup>s</sup> Heb. x. 1, 2.

<sup>t</sup> *Ib.* ix. 11, 12.

with the precious blood of CHRIST, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for (us)."<sup>a</sup> For "now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."<sup>v</sup>

Threefold  
view of  
CHRIST'S  
Death and  
Passion, as  
a reversal of  
Adam's Fall,  
as a satisfac-  
tion, and as  
a reconcilia-  
tion of God  
and man.

§. 2. The mystery then of CHRIST'S Death and Passion may be regarded in a threefold consideration; first, as a reversal of Adam's temptation and fall; secondly, as a satisfaction to GOD for the sin of man; and, thirdly, as the means of atonement and reconciliation of GOD and man, and the redemption of the latter from the power of sin and Satan to the life and obedience of GOD.

1. The reversal of Adam's temptation, disobedience, and fall, by the passion, obedience, and victory, of the second Adam, the 'New Man,' is not obscurely indicated by our LORD, when He saith, "the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me."<sup>w</sup> Nor is it necessary to repeat here the details of a topic, which is so fruitfully developed in religious meditations on the sufferings of JESUS; details, which embrace comparisons of time, place, and other circumstances.<sup>x</sup>

2. We mean by 'satisfaction' the price which CHRIST paid to redeem mankind from sin and the punishment of eternal death thereunto due.<sup>y</sup> "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON."<sup>z</sup> For "He gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."<sup>a</sup> "And for this cause He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."<sup>b</sup> "He who was sinless was not subject to

<sup>a</sup> 1 S. Pet. i. 18—20.

<sup>v</sup> Heb. ix. 26.

<sup>w</sup> S. John xiv. 30.

<sup>x</sup> As, for example, in S. Cyril of Jerusalem; *Kai ἐπειδὴ τῶν κατὰ παρὰδεδισιν ἡψάμεθα πραγμάτων τεθαύμακα ἀληθῶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν τύπων ἐν παρὰδεισφ ἢ ἀπόπτωσις, καὶ ἐν κήρυξ ἢ σωτηρία. ἀπὸ ξύλου ἢ ἁμαρτία, καὶ μέχρι*

*ξύλου ἢ σωτηρία. δειλινὸν τοῦ Κυρίου περιπατοῦντος ἐκρύβησαν καὶ δειλινὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς παρὰδεδισιν ὁ ληστής εἰσάγεται. Cateches. xiii.*

<sup>y</sup> Durand. in Sent. L. iii. Dist. 19, qu. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Rom. v. 10.

<sup>a</sup> Titus ii. 14.

<sup>b</sup> Heb. ix. 15.

death, since death came into the world by sin. He dies however, and offers himself a sacrifice to the FATHER for us. For against Him had we transgressed; and it behoved Him to undertake the ransom for us, that so we might be delivered from condemnation. For far be the thought, that the LORD'S Blood was offered to the tyrant." <sup>c</sup> Durandus shows how the notion may be accepted in a limited form; "By sin man was principally bound to GOD, as relates to punishment, because he had principally sinned against GOD; but he was bound to the devil as a tormentor, to whom he was justly delivered by GOD'S permission; but the price of redemption ought to be paid to the principal, not to the intervening agent, and therefore CHRIST exhibited His death as the price of our redemption to GOD the FATHER for our reconciliation, and not to the devil." <sup>d</sup> CHRIST died, not to satisfy GOD'S wrath against us by suffering evil, (for mere punishment is reserved for the world to come,) but to give GOD that satisfaction by His unexampled obedience as might infinitely countervail the disobedience of Adam, and move GOD to abate the debt of punishment we owe Him, and to publish an act of grace admitting all to forgiveness and life everlasting, that sincerely observe the covenant entered into with GOD by baptism. (Thornd. *Of the Cov. of Gr.* c. xxix. §. 20.) I must note that the notion of a cruel and bloody ransom for sin is one of the 'ruling ideas' of remote Antiquity. It lay at the root of human sacrifices. Not only do we find this in the example of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, (the bare idea could not have shocked him, as it was rife among the Canaanites, (*Deut.* xii. 31.) and in the act of the king of Moab, (*2 Kings* iii. 27;) but we discern the motive of it in *Micah* vi. 7, "for the sin of my soul." It prevailed universally, as shown by the Greek legend of Iphigenia, the sanguinary rites of the Punic Kronos and the Keltic Taranis, and the diabolical extension of it among the Aztecs of Mexico.

\* Damascene here alludes to the notion of the ransom being paid to the Devil, who by his victory over Adam had acquired the right of a master over slaves; and it is partly borne out by S. Paul's employment of language denoting the emanci-

pation of bondmen: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son." (*Col.* i. 13; *Heb.* ii. 14.)

<sup>d</sup> Durand. *ubi supra*.



3. The immediate fruit of the Death of CHRIST was the sealing of a reconciliation or at-one-ment between GOD and man, by opening a communication with GOD through CHRIST : "in Whom after that (we) believed, (we) were sealed with the HOLY SPIRIT of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory ;" \* until that period shall have arrived, when the creation "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of GOD." †

CHRIST'S  
Death, suffi-  
cient for the  
salvation of  
all, efficient  
in the Elect.

§. 3. A question of the very greatest importance occurs here, namely, whether CHRIST'S Sacrifice and Death were really offered for the salvation of *all* men, or only for a portion, that is, for those who shall be found at the Last Day to have been chosen in the fore-knowledge of GOD before the foundation of the world and to have persevered unto the end ? At first sight, the fact of the Atonement, viewed as a reversal of the Fall of all mankind in the person of Adam, seems to require a corresponding restoration of all mankind in the person of the Second Adam. And the following texts appear to confirm the expectation raised by that analogy, that the salvation wrought by CHRIST should be extended to all descendants of Adam without exception : "For the love of CHRIST constraineth us ; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." ‡ "For there is one GOD, and one Mediator between GOD and men, the Man CHRIST JESUS ; Who gave Himself a ransom for all." § "And He is the propitiation for our sins : and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." ¶ But the moment we learn

\* Eph. i. 13, 14.

† Rom. viii. 21. Thus in the Gallican Sacramentary ; "Cujus Sanguine fuso pax in celo terraque firmata est. O vere preciosa est conventio pacis, quæ facta est oblatio sancti cruoris ! non auro, neque argento ; non gemmis, aut margaritis ; sed cruore effuso latere Salvatoris." Missa Prima Die Paschæ, ap. Mabillon. Mus. Italic. Tom. I. p. 329.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 14.

§ 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

¶ 1 S. John ii. 2. Some ancient Liturgies preserve this language ; as in the Gallican Sacramentary : "Quem natum pro salute universorum multitudo cœlestis exercitus Divinis laudibus honoravit." (Missa in Natale Domini, ap. Mabillon. Mus. Ital. I. 291.) "Quia pro universitate humani generis Salvator advenerat." (*Ibid.* 295.) And our own Liturgy has expressly ; "Who made there (by His one Oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation

that there are "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction,"<sup>j</sup> and that the very knowledge of CHRIST is "the savour of death unto death" "in them that perish,"<sup>k</sup> we are forced to limit the efficiency of the Atonement to the Elect only. And we find that Scripture itself anticipates us in correcting (as it were) the largeness of its terms by substituting another language in accordance with the actual results of the Sacrifice. Our LORD saith, "This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed *for many* for the remission of sins:"<sup>l</sup> and S. Paul, "So CHRIST was once offered to bear the sins of *many*:"<sup>m</sup> and we are warned that this was foreknown, before the Sacrifice had been offered or its fruits actually tested. Caiaphas "prophesied that JESUS should die for that nation (of the Jews); and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of GOD that were scattered abroad."<sup>n</sup> And JESUS prayed for the Elect only; "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given Me; for they are Thine."<sup>o</sup> It diminishes the regret I feel in differing from my teacher Thorndike on this head, that he scruples not to reject Augustine's teaching, and condescends to speak of "*grace at a distance*, sufficient to save all mankind, but not immediately provided for them, being left by GOD to His Church to provide for them." Truly, I am unable to struggle out of the mist. Hath the Church at any time been able to dispense the grace of perseverance to mankind? Doth the participation in Sacraments necessarily secure it? He means to say, that while salvation through CHRIST is the purpose of GOD towards all men, He leaves the effecting thereof to the ministry of His Church, and that the Church by her divisions and sins destroys the force of those motives, which should lead 'all men' to embrace Christianity; thereby leaving the unconvinced non-Christians to the law of Nature, and involving the Church in guilt. (Book II. c. xxiii. §§. 9, 14.) If GOD then from eternity purposes the salvation of all men,

and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." (Prayer of Consecration, Communion Office.)

<sup>j</sup> Rom. ix. 22.

<sup>k</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.

<sup>l</sup> S. Matth. xxvi. 28; S. Mark xiv. 23.

<sup>m</sup> Heb. ix. 28.

<sup>n</sup> S. John xi. 51, 52.

<sup>o</sup> *Ib.* xvii. 9.

but suffers men, that is, the Church to defeat His purpose, how doth this differ from saying that He purposes it effectually only in His chosen? S. Paul writes that GOD "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."<sup>p</sup> But he writes elsewhere; "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth." And, "Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved."<sup>q</sup> "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace."<sup>r</sup>

We may then accept the distinction of Divines, that looking to the value of the Sacrifice, it was sufficient for the expiation of all men's sins, albeit in its actual application it be limited to the Elect. "Against the wound of original sin, whereby the nature of all men was corrupt and mortified in Adam and whence grew the disease of all concupiscences, the true and singular remedy is the Death of the SON of GOD our LORD JESUS CHRIST; Who, being free from the debt of death, and Alone without sin, died for sinners and the debtors of death. As far then as relates to the magnitude and power of the price, and to the one origin of the human race, the Blood of CHRIST is the redemption of the whole world. But they who pass through this world without the faith of CHRIST and without the sacrament of regeneration are alien to redemption." That is to say, so far as relates to covenant. When therefore all are rightly said to be redeemed on account of the unity of nature in all and the one origin of all assumed in truth by our LORD, and yet all have not been delivered from bondage; the property of redemption doubtless is theirs out of whom the prince of this world hath been expelled, and who are no longer vessels of the devil but members of CHRIST."<sup>s</sup> I am aware that I am here citing a Father who cannot challenge the highest degree of authority. But when they

<sup>p</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Rom. ix. 18, 27.

<sup>r</sup> *Ib.* xi. 5.

<sup>s</sup> *Prosperi Aquitani Responsiones ad objectiones Vincentianas*, in *Appendice ad S. Aug. Opp. Tom. X.*

p. 208. So Durandus: "Dicendum est, quod per Passionem Christi fuerunt omnes liberati ab omni poena peccati quoad sufficientiam, sed non quoad efficientiam." (*In Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 19, qu. 1, §. 9.*)

who would demur to my statement in this section themselves grant that God in His secret wisdom permits the *defeat* of the effect of the means He hath provided for men's salvation, what is it but that those means, even CHRIST'S Death, be efficient only where His purpose stands, in the Elect, though sufficient to save all? (Thornd. *Of the Cov. of Gr.* c. xxii. §. 9. See Estius, *Ad Timoth.* i. 4.)

§. 4. Among the objections to this cardinal doctrine of CHRIST'S Death and Passion may be noticed the question raised formerly by Peter Abelard; "What necessity or what reason or what concern was there, when the Divine Mercy might have delivered man from sin by Its command alone, that the SON of GOD Incarnate should sustain so many and so great fastings, insults, scourges, spitting, lastly the ignominious and most sharp death of the Cross, so as to bear it in company with the wicked?" The answer is supplied by S. Bernard; "It was our necessity, and the hard necessity of them that sat in darkness and the shadow of death. It was the concern (*opus*) equally of us and of GOD Himself and of the holy Angels. Ours, that He should take away the yoke of our captivity. His own, that the purpose of His will might be fulfilled. The Angels', that their number might be fulfilled. Moreover, the reason of this was the good pleasure of the doer. Who shall deny that there were not other and abundant modes of our redemption, justification, deliverance, at hand to the ALMIGHTY? But this doth not prejudice the efficacy of this which He chose out of many. And perchance He supplies one, whereby we might be more strongly and vividly reminded of our oblivion, heaviness, and fall on earth by the so many and so great burthens of our Redeemer. But otherwise no man knoweth nor can know to the full. But if it is not allowed us to sift the mystery of the Divine Will, we may however feel the effect of the work, and perceive the fruit of its utility. And what is allowed us to know, it is not permitted us to be silent about it; since 'It is the glory of GOD to conceal a thing; but the honour of kings to search out a matter.'<sup>1</sup> This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that, when we were yet sinners,

Objections  
to the doc-  
trine of the  
Atonement.

<sup>1</sup> Prov. xxv. 2.

'we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON.'<sup>a</sup> Where reconciliation is, there also is remission of sins. For if, as the Scripture saith, 'your iniquities have separated between you and your GOD,'<sup>b</sup> while sin remains, there is no reconciliation. In what then is remission of sins? 'This Cup,' He saith, 'of the New Testament in My Blood, which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.'<sup>c</sup> Therefore where there is reconciliation, there is remission of sins. And what is that itself but justification? Whether therefore it be reconciliation or remission of sins, or justification, or even redemption, or deliverance from the bonds of the devil by whom we were held captive at his will; we obtain it by means of the Death of the Only-Begotten, being justified freely in His Blood; 'In Whom,' as the same (Apostle) saith, 'we have redemption through His Blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace.'<sup>d</sup>

Another objection takes the form of suppressing the enormity of that sin, which called for so large an expiation as the Blood of the Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world; and insists on the Prophetical Office of Him Who came to fulfil all righteousness, as the purpose of His manifestation on earth, and His perfect moral example as the great act of reconciling GOD to man. I again borrow S. Bernard's indignant reply to Abelard; "This righteousness of man in the Blood of the Redeemer is that which the man of perdition rejecting and scoffing at endeavours so far to make void, as to think and dispute that the entire fact of the LORD of Glory's having emptied Himself, His being made lower than the angels, His being born of a woman, His conversation in the world, His experience of infirmities, His suffering of indignities, lastly His return to His own by the death of the Cross, should be reduced to this only, namely, that by living and teaching He might deliver to men a form of life, and by suffering and dying might prefix a goal of charity. Did He then teach righteousness and not give it, show charity and not infuse it, and so return to His own?

<sup>a</sup> Rom. v. 10.<sup>b</sup> Isa. lix. 2.<sup>c</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 28. 1 Cor xi. 25.<sup>d</sup> Eph. i. 7.—S. Bernard. Epist. 190.

And is this all that great mystery of piety, which was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, appeared to angels, was preached to the Gentiles, believed on by the world, received up in glory? The incomparable teacher! who, opening to himself even the deep things of God, and making them clear and perviews to whom he wills, renders the highest mystery hidden from eternity so plain and open to us by his falsehood, that anyone you please, even the uncircumcised and unclean, may lightly pass through it; as if the Wisdom of God knew not how to provide against it, or neglected what Itself prohibited, but as if Itself had given the holy thing to dogs and pearls to swine. But it is not so. For though the manifestation was in the flesh, yet the justification was in the spirit; that spiritual things might be compared with spiritual, and that the natural man might not perceive the things which are of the Spirit of God, and that our faith might not be in the wisdom of words, but in the power of God. Whence the SAVIOUR saith, 'I thank thee, O FATHER, LORD of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.' And the Apostle; 'But if our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.'"<sup>a</sup>

§. 5. In this One Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Death, then, all former and later oblations for sin meet and terminate. Prospectively and retrospectively, in the way of prefiguration and of commemoration, all sacrifices and sacraments derive their lustre and efficacy from this one central glory. Therefore in the ancient Liturgies, when the Church solemnly pleads the merits of 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,'<sup>a</sup> and present in a mystery under the symbols of the Eucharistic Bread and Wine, she blends the memory of Abel, of Abraham, and of Melchisedec, with her own new oblation of praise; inasmuch as they proceeded from faith in the One Sacrifice of CHRIST.<sup>b</sup> "For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."<sup>c</sup> "For this is the LAMB of GOD,

The One Sacrifice, with its relation to the Eucharist.

<sup>a</sup> S. Matt. xi. 25.

<sup>b</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 3.—S. Bern. *ubi supra*.

<sup>c</sup> Rev. xiii. 8.

<sup>d</sup> See Renaudot. Liturg. S. Marci,

Tom. I. p. 151, and the Roman Canon Missæ.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. x. 14.

the Only-Begotten SON, Who taketh away the sins of the world, Who ceaseth not offering Himself for us, and defendeth us in His Presence with a perpetual advocacy; because being sacrificed He never dieth, but being slain He ever liveth."<sup>d</sup> This Sacrifice of CHRIST then was perfect and complete on the Cross, as far as concerns the bloody mactation or slaying of the Victim. And as the remission of sins is connected with this actual mactation, for "without shedding of blood is no remission;"<sup>e</sup> so "where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."<sup>f</sup> And we thence conclude that, strictly speaking, the Atonement was wrought absolutely on the Cross, and has thence effected our justification; as S. Paul saith, "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, CHRIST died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life."<sup>g</sup> "We are sanctified" then "through the offering of the body of JESUS CHRIST once for all (*ἐφάπαξ*)."<sup>h</sup> And that offering, as made by Himself, admits of no repetition or iteration.

But here arises a difficulty from the discrepancy existing between the Sacrifice of CHRIST on the Cross and those which preceded and prefigured It; for here the Priest and the Victim or Sacrifice is identical. Now in the type of the Atonement, namely, the sin-offering of the day of expiation, Aaron's work of atonement was incomplete in the mere mactation of the bullock and the goat, which was done at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; he had to take of the blood within the vail into the Holy of Holies, and there make atonement by burning incense and sprinkling the blood upon and before the mercy-seat.<sup>1</sup> "Into the second (tabernacle) went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the HOLY GHOST this signifying, that the way into the holiest

<sup>d</sup> Sacrament. Gallican. *ap. Ma-*  
billon. Mus. Italic. Tom. I. p. 332.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. ix. 22.

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid.* x. 18.

<sup>g</sup> Rom. v. 8—10.

<sup>h</sup> Heb. x. 10.

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xvi.

of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing. But CHRIST being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building ; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood . He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”<sup>j</sup> As the application of the ancient typical sacrifice required the acts subsequent to the mactation, as Aaron’s entering within the vail and censuring and sprinkling with blood the Mercy-seat, although the shedding of blood was the pledge of remission of sins ; so in the anti-type the benefits of the Atonement are applied to the Elect by the imperishable Priesthood of IMMANUEL, by His effectual intercessions at His FATHER’S right hand (typified by the ‘incense beaten small’), by His perpetual pleading of His meritorious Cross and Passion. “We have such an High Priest, Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens ; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the LORD pitched, and not man.”<sup>k</sup> “But this Man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto GOD by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.”<sup>l</sup> And as this supplemental part of the Atonement is being still carried on by our High Priest in the heavens, so is it continually represented on earth by those to whom He hath given “the ministry of reconciliation”<sup>m</sup> in the sacramental Sacrifice of the Eucharist, wherein we “do show the LORD’S death till He come.”<sup>n</sup> S. Paul alludes to this exhibition of our Redemption, coupled with the previous seal of justification in Baptism, still tracing the analogy with Aaron’s preparatory rite of purification.<sup>o</sup> “Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of JESUS, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh ; and having an High Priest over the house of GOD ; let us draw near with

<sup>j</sup> Heb. ix. 7, 8, 11, 12.

<sup>k</sup> *Ibid.* viii. 1, 2.

<sup>l</sup> *Ib.* vii. 24, 25.

<sup>m</sup> 2 Cor. v. 18.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 26.

<sup>o</sup> Lev. xvi. 4.



a true heart with full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." <sup>p</sup>

"The Body and Blood of CHRIST, once offered on the Cross," says Cassander, "is a perpetual sacrifice for the salvation of the whole world, which being once offered cannot be consumed, but remains efficacious to the remission of daily offences; wherefore also CHRIST, having a perpetual Priesthood in the heavens, in a manner daily offers this perpetual sacrifice for us, when He intercedes with the FATHER for us. And so the ministers of the Church in pursuance of His commandment daily offer that same Body of CHRIST, by way of a mystical representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice once for all performed; the Perpetual Victim of which Sacrifice, sitting in heaven at His FATHER's right hand, they have present on the holy Table; through Whom they supplicate GOD the FATHER, that He would make the grace of this Perpetual Victim to be effectual to all needs of body and soul; and because the virtue of this Sacrifice belongs equally to the living and to the dead, this Sacrifice is said to be offered for them also, for whom the virtue thereof is said to be effectual. Here therefore is no new Sacrifice; for there is here both the same Victim which was offered on the Cross, and a commemoration in a mystery of that Sacrifice performed on the Cross, and a representation of the Priesthood continued in the heavens, and an image of the Sacrifice of CHRIST; whereby is not effected a new propitiation and remission of sins, but that which was once for all sufficiently done on the Cross is besought to be efficacious for us also. And so the Ancients had an account in this mystical Sacrifice not so much of the Oblation once for all accomplished on the Cross, whereof the memory is here celebrated, as of the perpetual Priesthood and continual Sacrifice, which the everlasting Priest offers in heaven; the image whereof is here expressed by the solemn prayers of the ministers. Wherefore this Sacrifice is said to be done for the common salvation of all, but as an unbloody one, (and as Tertullian expresses it) with pure prayer." <sup>q</sup>

<sup>p</sup> Heb. x. 19-22.

<sup>q</sup> Consultatio Cassandri, *ap. Opp.* pp. 998, 9.

## CHAPTER XVI.

OF CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL, OF HIS RESURRECTION,  
AND ASCENSION.

§. 1. CHRIST, having truly suffered in the flesh, descended into Hell or Hades in His soul hypostatically united with His Godhead. The Scripture proof of this statement is clear and consistent. S. Paul saith of Him, "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.)" S. Peter expounds 'the lower parts of the earth' by 'hell,' or some impalpable, invisible, mysterious region or place, to express which we are forced to borrow material images implying time and locality. Nor can it be explained away by reference to the grave, because it is expressly stated that it was 'the soul' of JESUS which 'was not left in hell;' nor yet pretended that the 'pains of death' merely mean His sufferings on the cross, for when He surrendered His soul or spirit into His FATHER'S hands, He had said, 'It is finished.' 'The pains of death,' which GOD 'loosed' in JESUS, seem to be the absence of the full light of GOD'S countenance, and the earnest longing wherewith the souls of those who died before the Atonement had been completed yearned for the manifestation of the sons of GOD; which 'pains' of privation might affect those 'prisoners of hope,' who like David are 'not ascended into the heavens,'\* but could not assail JESUS; "Whom GOD hath raised, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not

Of CHRIST'S  
Descent into  
Hell.

\* Eph. iv. 8—10.

\* Acts ii. 34.

possible that He should be holden of it. For David speaketh concerning Him, 'I foresaw the LORD always before my face, for He is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption.' \* \* He (David) seeing this before spake of the resurrection of CHRIST, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption."<sup>4</sup>

S. Peter further declares the fact of CHRIST's descent into Hell, and mysteriously hints at its object. "For CHRIST also hath once suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to GOD, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit (or, *in the spirit*): by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of GOD waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."<sup>5</sup> The words of Zechariah are mystically applied to express the waiting of the souls of the Fathers in Hades for the joyful Advent of CHRIST among them; "As for thee, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water."<sup>6</sup> What change the descent of CHRIST actually wrought in the condition of the souls of the Fathers may not perhaps be determined with certainty; though some of the ancients scruple not to assert, that it was to make the Patriarchs and Prophets possessors of CHRIST, and to translate them to Paradise as '*appendices*' of His Re-

<sup>4</sup> Acts ii. 24—27.

<sup>5</sup> 1 S. Pet. iii. 18—20. I am inclined to interpret 'spirit' here of the soul of JESUS, as contrasted with His flesh; *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι*. Whether the 'disobedient spirits,' here mentioned, refer to those who perished on earth from their non-compliance with or disobedience to Noah's preaching, or to some traditional and ancient exposition of the 'sons of GOD' who loved the 'daughters of men,' implying a Fall of Angels, is a matter of insuperable difficulty. For if CHRIST's preaching in Hell

was to bring salvation to the disobedient Antediluvians, it would imply a different trial state from the present life, and contradict the stress laid in the subsequent clause on the 'few' that 'were saved by water,' which yet corresponded in figure with that Baptism which doth now save the Elect. If the 'disobedient spirits' be meant of Angels not irrecoverably fallen, it would savour of an idle curiosity to resolve what has been so imperfectly revealed.

<sup>6</sup> Zech. ix. 11.

surrection.\* S. Augustine admits the distinction of the *limbus Patrum* in these words: "But if it seems to be not absurdly believed, that even the ancient Saints, who held the faith of CHRIST to come, were in places indeed most removed from the torments of the ungodly, but (yet) in hell, until the Blood of CHRIST and His descent to those places should deliver them thence; doubtless thenceforward the good Faithful, now redeemed by that effused Blood, are entirely ignorant of hell, until they also with their bodies receive the good things which they merit."† Thus, "as the Sun of Righteousness rose upon the dwellers on earth, so He descended into hell, that the light might shine also on those that sate in darkness and the shadow of death; that, as He preached peace to those on earth, so also He might preach to those in Hades, that to Him 'every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;' and thus, having loosed those that were bound for ages, He again rose from the dead, and paved the way for our resurrection."‡

\* Tert. De Anima, c. 55, p. 304. S. Cyril of Jerusalem writes, "Κατ' ἤλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἵνα κἀκεῖθεν λυτρώσῃται τοὺς δίκαιους." Cateches. iv.

† S. Aug. De Civitate Dei, Lib. xx. c. 15.

‡ Phil. ii. 10.

§ S. Jo. Damasc. c. 76. So S. Hippolytus, "ὅτι καὶ ἐν νεκροῖς καταλόγησθαι, εὐαγγελίζμενος τὰς τῶν ἁγίων ψυχὰς, διὰ θανάτου τὸν θάνατον νικῶν." (De Anti-Christo, p. 37.) The view above stated, of CHRIST's descent into Hell and its object, was clearly maintained by English Protestant Divines in the sixteenth century and objected to by the Puritans; as may be seen from the words of an adversary to both parties. Speaking of their shifting translation of 'Hades,' one while by 'hell,' another while by 'the grave,' he says: "This mysterie we know not, and we would gladly learne it of the Puritan Calvinists, whose English translation perhaps this is: for, the grosser Calvinists (being not so pure and precise in following Calvine as the Puritans be, that have wel deserved that name above

their fellowes) they in their other English Bibles [*in margin*, 'Bib. an. 1562, and 1577'] have in this place discharged themselves of false translation, saying plainly, 'Thou shalt not leave my soule in Hel.' But in what sense they say so, it is very hard to gesse: and perhaps themselves can not tel yet what to make of it, as appeareth by M. Whitaker's answer to F. Campion. And he is now called a Bishop among them, [*margin*. 'M. Hues B. of S. Asaph in Walles,'] and proceeded Doctor in Oxford, that could not obtaine his grace to proceede Doctor in Cambridge, because he preached CHRIST's descending into Hel; and the Puritans in their second admonition to the Parliament, pag. 43, crie out against the politike Calvinists, for that in the Creede of the Apostles (made in English meeter and song openly in their Churches in these wordes: 'His Spirit did after this descend into the lower parts, To them that long in darke-nes were the true light of their hartes') they favour his descending into Hel very much, and so consequently may thereby build

Calvin's  
Theory.

§. 2. Not content with asserting CHRIST's descent into Hades, Calvin sets forth the horrible notion that His death would avail nothing, but He must "feel the severity of Divine vengeance, and, to satisfy God's justice, grapple closely with the Powers of Hell and the horror of eternal death." (*Institutes*, l. II. c. xvi. §. 9.) To this he appends, that CHRIST so paid the utmost penalty due to our sins, that He could not be holden of the pains of death. While rejecting this repulsive teaching, I hold it admissible that CHRIST did, in some incomprehensible yet real way, 'strip principalities and powers, and make a show of them openly,' (not in spiritual effect only,) 'triumphing over them,' (*Col.* ii. 15.) S. Jerome speaks of 'the hidden dispensations, which He fulfilled' in hell (*Ad Ephes.* c. iv.); and Augustine has no doubt of the benefits there wrought by Him. (*Epist.* 164.) I invite, in connection herewith, a careful consideration of ch. XIII. §. 6, and ch. XXX. §. 7 of this book.

Of His Re-  
surrection  
and Ascen-  
sion.

§. 3. As CHRIST's unction with the SPIRIT after His Baptism had reference to His triple function of Prophet, Priest, and King; as He had fulfilled the Prophetical office in expounding His FATHER's will to those whom He had chosen out of the world, the details whereof the Comforter, which is the HOLY GHOST, was to teach them, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever He had said unto them; \* as He had fulfilled the sacrificial part of the Priestly office by offering Himself on the Cross "to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;" <sup>b</sup> so it was necessary that He should complete His act by the function of intercession, by entering "into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others." <sup>c</sup> "But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice

Limbus Patrum and Purgatorie. And the Puritans in their second reply against M. Whitegift's defense pag. 7, reprehend one of their cheifest Calvinistical martyrs for affirming (as they tearme it) a grosse descending of our Saviour Christ into Hel. Thus the Puritanes confesse plainly their heretical doctrine against Christ's descending

into Hel." Discoverie of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures, ch. 7, p. 104; by Gregory Martin one of the readers of Divinitie in the English College of Rhemes, printed at Rhemes, by John Fogny, 1582.

\* S. John xiv. 26.

<sup>b</sup> Heb. ix. 26.

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* vv. 24, 25.

for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of GOD."<sup>d</sup> "Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto GOD by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."<sup>e</sup> "If CHRIST be not risen," is the argument of S. Paul, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain; ye are yet in your sins."<sup>f</sup> But he triumphantly adds, "But now is CHRIST risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive."<sup>g</sup> The Atoning work of our High Priest is evidently incomplete and in vain, unless He applies it to those for whom He originally undertook it; and that is done by the exercise of His Kingly function of leading captivity captive and giving gifts unto men,<sup>h</sup> of restoring harmony in His Creation, and of establishing and consolidating the kingdom of His Elect. He "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."<sup>i</sup> "And He is the head of the body, the Church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the FATHER that in Him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things to Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."<sup>j</sup> As His Death was the seal of the remission of our sins; so His Resurrection was the proof of His power to ensure to us the glorious consequences of that remission, namely, our sanctification through the indwelling of the HOLY GHOST, and the salvation of body and soul in a blissful eternity. "This JESUS," saith S. Peter, "hath GOD raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of GOD exalted, and having received of the FATHER the promise of the HOLY GHOST, He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear."<sup>k</sup> "He," says Tertullian, "being called Mediator between GOD and men from the deposit of either part

<sup>d</sup> *Ib.* x. 12.<sup>e</sup> *Ib.* vii. 25.<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 14, 17.<sup>g</sup> *Ib.* vv. 20—22.<sup>h</sup> Eph. iv. 8.<sup>i</sup> Rom. iv. 25.<sup>j</sup> Col. i. 18 - 20.<sup>k</sup> Acts ii. 32, 33.

committed to Him, preserves the deposit of flesh also in Himself, an earnest of the entire sum. For even as He hath left to us an earnest of the SPIRIT, so also hath He received from us an earnest of the flesh, and carried into heaven a pledge of the whole sum to be sometime reduced thither. Be ye secure, flesh and blood; ye have conquered both heaven and the kingdom of GOD in CHRIST."<sup>1</sup>

"After His Resurrection from the dead He laid aside all sufferings and bodily wants. But no portion of His nature laid He aside, nor body nor soul; but He hath both His body and His soul endowed with reason and intellect, with will and action; and thus He returned into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of His FATHER; by which we do not mean a local one. For how should the Incomprehensible have a local right hand? since right and left belong to circumscribed beings. But by 'the right hand of the FATHER' we mean the glory and the honour of the Godhead. Wherein the SON of GOD, existing before the ages, as GOD and co-essential with the FATHER, at last being incarnate, sitteth also bodily, His flesh having been glorified together with Him; for He is worshipped with one worship together with His flesh by all creation."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tert. De Resurrectione Carnis, c. 51, p. 357.

<sup>2</sup> S. Joan. Damasc. De Orth. Fide, capp. 77, 78.

## CHAPTER XVII.

## OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§. 1. "THE Passion of CHRIST was the universal cause of the remission of sins, (both original and actual); which must needs be applied to individuals, in order to obtain its effect in them; and this application is made through faith and charity and the receiving of the Sacraments."<sup>a</sup> And thus CHRIST Himself subjoins remission of sins immediately to His Passion and Resurrection, as the fruit and consequence of those transactions; "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved CHRIST to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."<sup>o</sup> But, before we consider the gift of the remission of sins, as we have traced the process whereby the Donor earned for Himself the right to bestow it by satisfying the demands of Divine Justice, let us regard the person and character of the recipients. They are called in Scripture *Believers*, because their acceptance of His message is analytically and ultimately at the root of their obedience to Him; "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of GOD, even to them that believe on His Name."<sup>p</sup> They are called *Elect*, in so far as they are known of GOD; "Elect according to the foreknowledge of GOD the FATHER, through sanctification of the SPIRIT, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of JESUS CHRIST;"<sup>q</sup> for "the foundation of GOD standeth sure, having this seal, The LORD knoweth them that

Of the Visible Church  
and of the  
Elect People  
of God.

<sup>a</sup> Durand. in Lib. iii. Sent. Dist.  
19, qu. 1.

<sup>o</sup> S. Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

<sup>p</sup> S. John i. 12.

<sup>q</sup> 1 S. Peter i. 2.



are His.”<sup>r</sup> They are termed *the Church* or *Assembly* (Ἐκκλησία, from ἐκκαλεῖν, to call or evoke), not only because it was a natural term to designate the relation and connection of Believers one with another, but also because spiritually ‘God hath called’ them out of the world ‘unto His kingdom and glory.’<sup>s</sup> And CHRIST had employed the appellation, saying, “Upon this rock I will build My Church.”<sup>t</sup> And as it is the most absolute and independent term, less needing the expression of other ideas to which it bears a relation, and embracing as it were the substantive fact of the existence of the society of Christians, as they appear to the world at large, its employment has been more universal, and has been sanctioned by Scripture; “And the LORD added to the Church daily such as should be saved.”<sup>u</sup>

But the term, which expresses more exactly the relation of the Risen and Glorified Redeemer to the recipients of His grace, is that of His *Kingdom*, that is, the State or Polity wherein He is the Sovereign and they His subjects. That this term, though intended in its fullest extent of meaning for the completion of bliss after the consummation of all things, is also indicative of CHRIST’S Church in its objective and visible condition on earth at present, will be evident from hence; that it is used to express an imminent fact by S. John Baptist: “Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.”<sup>v</sup> Our LORD treats it as something already present; “And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.”<sup>w</sup> Its inauguration in the sufferings of its Sovereign was celebrated by unconscious lips as blended with the typical glories of David: “Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the LORD.”<sup>x</sup> It grows in intensity, as its development draws nigh: “Fear not, little flock; for it is your FATHER’S good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”<sup>y</sup> And, when CHRIST had instituted the sacramental pledges of remission of sins, He formally

<sup>r</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 19.

<sup>s</sup> 1 Thess. ii. 12.

<sup>t</sup> S. Matt. xvi. 18.

<sup>u</sup> Acts ii. 47.

<sup>v</sup> S. Matt. iii. 2.

<sup>w</sup> *Ibid.* xi. 12.

<sup>x</sup> S. Mark xi. 10.

<sup>y</sup> S. Luke xii. 32.

proclaimed to His Apostles the part which He assigned to them in His new and spiritual kingdom: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My FATHER hath appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."\* Yet this Kingdom of God was not so much a new institution, as (to borrow a foreign term) the *re-habilitation* of what had always existed. For it was through the same faith, whereby Christian believers are now justified, that the elders before and after the Law of Moses "obtained a good report," albeit they "received not the promise" in equal measure with ourselves; "GOD having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."†

With this comprehension S. Clement of Alexandria defines the Church: "According then to substance and conception, according to its origin and eminence, we affirm that there is alone the ancient and Catholic Church, that by the will of One God through One LORD gathereth together into the unity of One Faith (that is one) according to its proper testaments, yet rather according to the Testament that is one at different times, those who have been already ordained, whom God hath predestinated, having known before the foundation of the world that they would be righteous."‡ And S. Augustine: "The Church is the people of God throughout all nations, all Saints being joined and thereunto numbered, who lived in this world even before His coming, so believing that He would come, even as we believe that He hath come."§ The very largeness of the terms 'Church' and 'Kingdom of God' seems to produce perplexity. For while S. Paul speaks of GOD the FATHER'S having "translated us into the kingdom of His dear SON,"¶ he elsewhere saith "that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"‡ and prays that the LORD would "preserve him unto His heavenly kingdom."§ This ambiguity arises from the fact, that the Elect People of GOD, "they which shall be ac-

\* *Ibid.* xxii. 29, 30.

† Heb. xi. 39, 40.

‡ S. Clem. Alex. Strom. L. vii. p. 549.

§ S. Aug. De Catechizandis rudibus, cap. 3, Tom. VI. p. 266.

¶ Col. i. 13.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 50.

§ 2 Tim. iv. 18.

counted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead,"<sup>s</sup> are at present necessarily involved in the outward frame and polity of the Catholic Church; so that the casket, with whatsoever of earthly alloy, derives a venerable character from those precious 'jewels'<sup>h</sup> of GOD which it encloses.

S. Augustine's definition embraces the term 'Church' in its most extensive acceptation, as it would signify "the Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven."<sup>i</sup> Now in that sense the aggregation of those who shall be finally saved must necessarily be beyond human cognisance. Yet we want to know what is the medium between the Invisible and the Visible, seeing that the Church is One? Are the Elect to elude our grasp, and to vanish into a mere ideal abstraction? Is there no conciliating process that shall bind together the Predestined unto grace and glory with the universality of those 'who profess and call themselves Christians?' The explanation, I think, must be found herein; namely, that, in consequence of the admixture of tares with the spiritual wheat, the terms, which in Scripture are applied to the latter, are practically subject to a large modification of meaning. Thus, in right of their Baptism those are entitled to the designation of Elect, who, if we could see as GOD seeth, should rather be termed Reprobate. They are called Faithful and Believers, who merely make an objective external profession of the true Faith of CHRIST; whereas true saving Faith is not only of the head, but of the heart, as S. Paul saith; "But GOD be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you."<sup>j</sup> They are termed Regenerate, who, as partaking of the 'one Baptism for the remission of sins,' attain to some of its privileges; yet, inasmuch as their names are not written in the Book of Life, are not born of GOD in that absolute sense in which it is said, "Whosoever is born of GOD doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of GOD."<sup>k</sup>

<sup>s</sup> S. Luke xx. 35.

<sup>h</sup> Mal. iii. 17.

<sup>i</sup> Heb. xii. 23.

<sup>j</sup> Rom. vi. 17.

<sup>k</sup> 1 S. John iii. 9.

But although a practical discrepancy is felt, when the outward visible Church fails to realise in its members the ideal which Scripture supplies of the Elect People of GOD, theological language remains the same. The ancient definition of the Church as 'the congregation of the Elect'<sup>1</sup> is interpreted by the stream of authorities as 'the congregation of the Faithful';<sup>2</sup> and the objective character of the term 'Faithful' is shown by its being convertible with the term 'Catholics.' The essence of the one Faith, according to S. Jerome, is 'to stand in the verity of doctrines.'<sup>3</sup> The Elect then are to be sought in the Visible Communion of the Church, among the professors of the true Faith. They are "the congregation of them whom GOD foreseeth that they shall persevere" in His grace to the end. (*Thorndike*, Bk. III. c. xxx. §. 17.) They are not distinct nor in fact at present separable from the Visible Church Catholic or Body of the Faithful in CHRIST; but are rather the sound members of that mystical Body, only partially cognisable by men, but whose number is known to GOD, being registered in the Book of Life; for "the LORD knoweth them that are His."<sup>4</sup>

§. 2. Up to this point the Christian Church has been defined to be 'the congregation of the Elect,' included in the general designation of 'the Faithful;' and the one Faith which binds them is the profession of true Dogma or a uniform standard of Revealed Truths. All other additions are but expansions of the term 'Faithful,' or attempts to ascertain its historical or theological value. Thus Unity is expressed by the emphatic singular 'congregation.' Sanctity, Apostolicity, and Catholicity combine in the complex idea expressed by the term 'Faithful,' considered objectively. But one distinguishing epithet must needs be noticed, which, although it be not found in Scripture, is ever repeated in the Creeds and formularies of the Church, and has probably been familiar to Christians from the time that the "fulness of the

Of the term  
'Catholic.'

<sup>1</sup> τὸ ὄργανον τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν Ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. S. Clem. Alex. Strom. VII. p. 514.

<sup>2</sup> Cœtus Fidelium. Articul. Religionis xix.

<sup>3</sup> "Ecclesia non parietibus consistit sed in veritate dogmatum. Ecclesia ibi est ubi fides una est." S. Hieron. Enarrat. in Ps. cxxxiii.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 19.

Gentiles" began to "come in,"<sup>p</sup> and "the gathering of the people" to Shiloh.<sup>q</sup> It is the word 'Catholic.' It is applied to God's people under the Gospel as gathered out of all nations, Gentiles as well as Jews, without distinction of caste or nationality; "where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but CHRIST is all and in all."<sup>r</sup> This is the received interpretation of its meaning, as may be inferred from S. Cyril of Jerusalem, who dwells upon its spread throughout the Roman Empire; <sup>s</sup> and from S. Augustine.<sup>t</sup> As it commenced with the characteristics of the Christian Church as compared with the Jewish, its universality of range and comprehension of the Gentiles; so it continued to be applied to the main body of believers, who continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, even when the original reasons for its adoption had become less obvious. Thus, in the Dialogue against the Marcionites which passes under the name of Origen, Megethius the Marcionite urges the apparently sectarian use of the term; "Even you are called Catholics (τῆς καθολικῆς). You are not then Christians, not even you." Adamantius replies; "If we had acquired a man's appellation, you had said well: but if we are called from our being throughout the whole world, what harm is there in this?"<sup>u</sup>

I cannot think that even in the earliest instance of its employment by local Churches, as by the Church of Smyrna in its Account of the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp,<sup>v</sup> it was intended to express the reason of its original application to the Christian Church, so much as to mark the fact of belonging to that One Holy Church, in contra-distinction to the heretics or separatists who had quitted the main body. "They went out from us, but they were not of us."<sup>w</sup> So S. Pacian defends

<sup>p</sup> Rom. xi. 25.

<sup>q</sup> Gen. xlix. 10.

<sup>r</sup> Col. iii. 11.

<sup>s</sup> Καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται, διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων. Cateches. xviii. p. 270. He goes on however to develop its meaning rhetorically.

<sup>t</sup> "Ipsa est enim Ecclesia Catho-

lica, unde καθολικὴ Græcè appellatur, quod per totum orbem terrarum diffunditur." Ep. 52, ad Severinum, Tom. II. p. 119.

<sup>u</sup> Orig. cont. Marcionitas, §. i. p. 12.

<sup>v</sup> Cap. xvi. ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. iv. c. 15.

<sup>w</sup> 1 S. John ii. 19.

its continued and local employment: "But you will say, In the Apostles' time no one was called a Catholic. Be it so, let it have been so, even grant that. When after the Apostles' time heresies existed, and by different names endeavoured to tear by bits and rend God's Dove<sup>\*</sup> and Queen;<sup>†</sup> did not the Apostolic people require a surname, in order to distinguish its unity, lest the error of some should through her members lacerate the unsullied Virgin of God? Was it not becoming that the principal section should be marked by its proper appellation? When I perchance had entered a populous city at the present day and found Marcionites Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatianists, and the rest of that sort, who call themselves Christians, by what surname should I have recognised the congregation of my people, unless it were called Catholic?" "Christian is my name, but Catholic is my surname. That names me, this distinguishes me. By this I am approved, by the former am I signified."<sup>‡</sup> So by accident, as it were, the term 'Catholic' came eventually to denote the orthodox Church of the original stock, which could claim an historical identity and continuity with the primary societies of Apostolic foundation, as distinct from the new sects which from time to time attempted an independent existence; and when we profess to believe 'one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,' such profession is tantamount to a declaration of adherence to the main Body of Believers, coming down to our own times in unbroken succession from the Apostles, the cradle and earthly home of God's Elect People; and therefore, with whatever shortcomings and incidental errors, (however paradoxical the assertion may be,) spiritually and in the sight of God and His Angels, the pure and immaculate Spouse of CHRIST.<sup>§</sup> It will be seen that this conception aims at embracing all that is morally noble in humanity; but pre-supposes the preaching

<sup>\*</sup> Canticles ii. 14.

<sup>†</sup> Ps. xlv. 9.

<sup>‡</sup> S. Pacianus ad Sympronian. Epist. i. *ap.* Bibliothecam Maximam Patrum, Tom. IV. p. 306.

<sup>§</sup> That the original meaning of the term 'Catholic' came to be felt as insufficient in the later ages of

the Church is clear from the example of the Donatists: "Donatistæ autem responderunt, non Catholicum nomen ex universitate gentium, sed ex plenitudine sacramentorum institutum." S. Aug. Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis, c. iii. T. IX. p. 555.

of the Gospel to every creature, (a condition yet unfulfilled,) and is silent as to intellectual aristocracy. That silence offends 'the Greeks' or Humanists now as of old. 'The grand development of human reason, from Aristotle down to Hegel,' is to them 'a great spiritual unity far transcending that of the unthinking members of the Catholic Church.' (Pattison, *Memoirs*, p. 210.) Something of this feeling led the Carpocratian Gnostics to adore Homer and Pythagoras along with JESUS and Paul. They were alike regarded as princes in a realm of thought. (S. Aug. *De Hæresibus*.)

Of the full  
definition of  
the Church  
Catholic.

§. 3. To arrive at a closer grasp of the idea with which we are dealing, I propose to examine a few details which are frequently embraced in the definition of the Church. It is clear, that, if the Church is a Society or Congregation, there must be some *tessera* or outward mark whereby its unity and corporate existence may be tested. Without such mark its entity vanishes into a mere abstraction. The fact of persons being baptized supplies the first and most obvious means of discriminating the Church. "For as many of you as have been baptized into CHRIST have put on CHRIST," saith S. Paul.<sup>b</sup> And Firmilian writes, "For they who are baptized doubtless fill up the number of the Church."<sup>c</sup> "That is called the Church," says Canus, "which is gathered, in CHRIST's Name through baptism; which both is a sacrament of the Faith, and properly makes members and parts of the Church, and distinguishes CHRIST's Church from the Synagogue."<sup>d</sup> Then having ascertained the existence of such a body as the Church by this means, we must perceive that every society has its peculiar laws, regulations, and statutes, which serve as its bond of union and are necessary to its holding together at all as a society. These laws, in the case of this Divine Society, are their mutual coherence and interdependence by means of right Faith and the Sacraments.\*

<sup>b</sup> Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>c</sup> Ap. S. Cyprian. Ep. 85, p. 325.

<sup>d</sup> Canus, *De Locis Theologicis*,  
L. iv. c. ii. p. 118.

\* "Catholici definiunt Ecclesiam  
societatem eorum, qui per rectam

fidem et sacramenta sibi mutuo  
coherent." Estius, in *Annotationi-  
bus ad præcipua et difficiliora loca  
Scripturæ Sacræ*, ad cap. xviii.  
Matthæi.

This last essential condition of the Church is dwelt upon by Thorndike: "For to the constitution of this Society there goes more than to believe the Faith with the heart, which, being of itself invisible, cannot be sufficient to constitute the society of the Church, which is visible, more than to profess Christianity to the world: for so do they, we see, that dispute that there is no such thing as any society of the Church, because they suppose not that Christianity obligeth them to communicate in the public service of GOD and the ordinances wherein it consisteth. But this being supposed, together with the condition upon which men are admitted to Christianity, as the condition upon which they communicate in the same, there needs nothing else to make the Church such a society as we speak of, (that is, a community, corporation, or spiritual commonwealth)." <sup>f</sup> Concurrently Dr. Jackson writes: "It is then profession of the same faith, participation of the sacraments, and subjection to the same laws and ordinances ecclesiastic, which makes the visible Church to be one." <sup>g</sup>

But at this point we are constrained to ask, how are these Sacraments to be administered? how are these Laws and Ordinances Ecclesiastic to be interpreted and enforced? Is it all a matter of hap-hazard, or has the ministration of the Word and Sacraments been anywise vested or secured? Here Antiquity supplies us with a fresh objective test, that of adhesion to Episcopal Government. Thus S. Cyprian; "They are the Church, the people united to its Bishop (*sacerdoti*), and the flock adhering to its pastor. Whence you should know that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop. \* \* Since the Church, which is one Catholic (Church), is not rent or divided, but is certainly connected and conjoined by the cement of Bishops mutually cohering." <sup>h</sup> In those early times this was considered sufficient. For although the same venerable Bishop and Martyr refers to the See of Rome as "the Chair of Peter and the principal Church whence hath sprung sacerdotal unity," regarding its position as the only See in the West

<sup>f</sup> Review of the Right of the Church in a Christian State, chap. i. §. 6. Works, Vol. I. Part ii. p. 640.

Anglo-Cath. Libr. Ed. Oxon. 1844.

<sup>g</sup> Works, Tom. III. p. 834.

<sup>h</sup> Epist. 66, *ad Pappianum*.



which could trace its succession directly to the Apostles, and possibly not without allusion to his own See of Carthage having derived its Christianity from Rome; he takes care to exclude any claim of jurisdiction that might arise from such an admission. For he states, that "it was determined by us all (that is, by the Bishops of Africa), and it is alike equitable and just, that each person's cause should be there heard where the fact he is charged with has occurred, and that a portion of the flock be ascribed to individual pastors, which each of them may govern, being to render an account of his action to the LORD."<sup>1</sup> And again: "The bond of concord remaining and the undivided Sacrament of the Catholic Church persevering, each single Bishop directs his own action, being to render to the LORD an account of his purpose."<sup>2</sup>

Happy indeed would Christendom have been, if the principle here expressed could have remained intact without injury to the interests of religion! But that it could not stand in practice is proved by the fact, that Cyprian himself died out of actual communion with the See of Rome and the major part of the Church Catholic; and that his own 'purpose' of rebaptizing heretics (with some exceptions) has been formally repudiated by the Œcumenical Synod of Nice.<sup>3</sup> Hence arose the necessity for certain centres in the Episcopate, which might serve to maintain the united action of that vast body. For, if in the time of the Council of Ephesus the Bishops of the Church throughout the Roman Empire who were favourable to Cyril of Alexandria's views were estimated at *six thousand*, (not counting the adherents of Nestorius), is any apology needed for the development of an elaborate system of Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Patriarchs? <sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 59. *ad Cornelium*.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 55, *ad Antonianum*.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 8. The exception in Canon 19 relates to the Paulianists or followers of Paul of Samosata, who were heretical touching CHRIST'S Divinity. In the First Council of Arles, Canon 8, provision is made for either rebaptizing or merely reconciling by imposition of hands the Arians (or Africans), according as it should be clear from their an-

swers that they had been baptized into the true faith of the HOLY TRINITY.

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted for this interesting fact to a statement of the Archimandrite Dalmatius: *eis δὲ τὸ μέρος τὸ ἕτερον, τοῦτεστιν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Κυρίλλου, εἶπον αὐτῷ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐμ- προσθεν πάντων. Τίνος θέλεις ἀκούσαι, τῶν ἑξακισχιλίων ἀριθμῷ ἐπισκόπων ἢ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου δυσσεβοῦς; Τοὺς δὲ ἑξακισχιλίους εἶπον, οἵτινες εἰσιν ὑπὸ*

germs of this system appear in the subordinate position of Syria and Cilicia (provinces) in respect to Antioch (their metropolis); and of all relatively to Jerusalem, (the centre of Apostolic power,) whose 'decrees' they received "for to keep." (*Acts* xv. 23. xvi. 4.) But the system was carried out on the lines of the civil administration of the Roman Empire.

Yet S. Cyprian, himself the strong champion of Episcopal independence, hesitated not to ascribe a beginning of unity to S. Peter. Expounding the unity of the Church, he thus writes: "The LORD saith to Peter, 'I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"<sup>m</sup> And again after His Resurrection He saith to the same, 'Feed My sheep.'<sup>n</sup> He buildeth His Church on one person. And although He giveth equal power to all the Apostles and saith, 'As My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you. Receive ye the HOLY GHOST. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained';<sup>o</sup> yet, that He might manifest unity, by His authority He ordained the origin of the same unity to begin from one person. That which Peter was, were the other Apostles, to be sure; endowed with an equal partnership both of honour and of power; but *the beginning proceeds from unity*, that the Church might be shown to be one."<sup>p</sup> Archbishop Bramhall, constrained by the consent of Christian Antiquity, admits that he should not have excepted against 'a primacy of order' or 'beginning of unity.' (*Schism Guarded, Works*, Vol. II. p. 596.) S. Optatus of Milevis, the contemporary of S. Augustine, thus applies the Primacy of S. Peter to the See of Rome: "You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the episcopal chair was conferred on Peter first; wherein sate Peter chief (*caput*) of all the Apostles, whence too he was styled Cephas. In

τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῶν μητροπολιτῶν ἁγίων ἐπισκόπων. Concil. Ephes. Actio. vi. ap. Labbe. Tom. III. p. 753.

<sup>m</sup> S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

<sup>n</sup> S. John xxi. 16.

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid.* xx. 21—23.

<sup>p</sup> S. Cyprian. De Unitate Ecclesiae, p. 108.

which one Chair unity might be preserved by all, lest the other Apostles should each claim his own; so that now he should be a schismatic and a sinner, who should set up another against that singular Chair. Therefore in that one Chair, which is first as regards endowments, sate Peter first, to whom succeeded Linus;” [he then enumerates the Bishops of Rome successively down to] “Siricius at the present day, who is our associate; along with whom the whole world agrees with us in one fellowship of communion by the interchange of letters of communion” (“*commercio formatarum*”).<sup>a</sup> Nor is it surprising after this, when public opinion had set strongly in this channel, to find Philip the Legate of the Apostolic See at the Council of Ephesus enouncing the Primacy in the following strong terms: “It is doubtful to no one, but rather was known in all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, the prince and chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our LORD JESUS CHRIST the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race; and to him hath been given power of binding and loosing sins; *who up to the present time and ever both lives and adjudicates in his successors.* (ὅστις ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ διαδόχοις καὶ ζῇ καὶ δικάζει.) His successor then in order and vicar, our holy and most blessed Pope Celestine the Bishop hath sent us to this holy Synod to supply his presence.”<sup>\*</sup> Note this decided extension of the principle of Episcopacy thus proclaimed without demur or contradiction in a General Council. Even outsiders, like the pagan soldier-historian Ammianus Marcellinus, perceived this as a fact; the emperor Constantius wished (he says) to strengthen his action against S. Athanasius “by the authority wherein the bishops of the Eternal City surpassed,” (“*quâ potiores æternæ urbis episcopi.*”) (*Lib.* xv. c. 7.) Thorndike maintains it would be impossible to show how S. Peter’s personal pre-eminence “comes entailed on the Church of Rome,” when that of the other Apostles rested not on the churches of their foundation. (Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 407.) But if that pre-eminence touched the government of

<sup>a</sup> S. Opt. Lib. ii. 48 *circ. init.*

<sup>\*</sup> Conc. Ephes. Action. iii.  
Labbe. T. III. p. 625.

the Church and insured Unity, you have a reason for its perpetuity. And if so, what church could better pretend to its inheritance than that which was nearest to him and received his last words? (See *Gen.* xv. 2. *2 Kings* ii. 10.) Indeed, Thorndike points out that "he that admits not the regular preeminence, denying the unlimited power, of the Church of Rome over other Churches, will never give a reason, why recourse is always had to the Church of Rome, and yet, if the cause require, to other Churches, to balance it." (Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 429.) On the other side, note his remarkable admission of the fatal effect of the Reformation in rendering indistinct the *Visible Church*. (Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 401.) I may not pass over in silence the unhappy tendency to widen the breach between us and foreign Churches by the boastful use of the term 'National Church,' which term, as Thorndike says, is "barbarous to the language of the Scriptures" (Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 368); and the habit of denouncing as 'un-English' what is merely unfamiliar goes too near a repudiation of duty to the Catholic Church. So long as men urged the short but illogical plea that the Pope is Antichrist and His Church idolaters, it gave the Reformation a conquest entire; after the Council of Trent, Rome offers no terms of reconciliation but of conquest. If the primitive Church be conceived of as 'National' in the sense of being conterminous with the civil polity or the dominant race that embraced it, then it seems she was *the Church of the Roman empire*, in a word, the Church of Rome. The rivalry between the empires of East and West gave birth to the Great Schism. The growth of European nationalities finally rent the Western Church.

I have thought it the more necessary to notice the above important testimonies of Antiquity to the Primacy of S. Peter and of the See of Rome, because I am convinced that the suppression of them, whether from wilfulness or inadvertency, tells greatly in favour of the Papal claims. It was not any pretence of autocephalous jurisdiction or of a platform of English Episcopacy as against Papal authority, that formed the original justification of the *Protestant* position of the Anglican Church, but a bold and uncompromising charge of corruption in doctrine and discipline brought against the successor

of S. Peter and his adherents. The usurpation of jurisdiction was a *gravamen* of secondary importance ; although it might be urged that the Pope had long before succeeded in bringing about that state of things which S. Cyprian deprecated in full Synod : “ For neither doth any one of us constitute himself a Bishop of Bishops, nor by tyrannical terror drive his colleagues to the necessity of obeying ; since every Bishop hath his own choice according to the licence of his liberty and power, and may not be judged by another, even as he himself also may not judge.”\* And it might be desired even on ecclesiastical grounds to return to the conditions, prescribed by the Nicene Synod, and pressed on the attention of Pope Celestine by the African Council, A.D. 424 : “ They ” (that is the Nicene Fathers) “ most prudently and most justly provided, that (all) affairs whatsoever should be decided in the localities where they had their origin ; for that the grace of the HOLY SPIRIT would not be wanting to each particular province, whereby equity might be constantly maintained by CHRIST’S Bishops (*sacerdotibus*) : most especially, since it hath been granted to every one, if he be offended by the judgment of those who tried his case, to appeal to the Councils of his province or even to a Universal Council. Unless perchance any one believes, that our God can inspire justice of examination into an individual, and deny it to innumerable Bishops gathered together in Council.”†

Of the Notes  
of the  
Church.

§. 4. A few words should be added touching the Notes or marks, whereby according to some theologians the Catholic Church may be distinguished. The following statement of S. Augustine will be found agreeable with the principles already laid down, although not so clear in its application, owing to the schisms which have since afflicted the Church. “ For in the Catholic Church,” he writes, “ to omit her most genuine wisdom, at the knowledge whereof few spiritual men arrive in this life, so as to know it in the least ; there be many other things which most justly hold me in her bosom. The consent of peoples and nations holds me. Authority, com-

\* S. Cyp. in Conc. Carthag. Opp. T. I. p. 229.

† Epist. Conc. Africani ad Papam Cælestinum, *op. Labbe*. Tom. II. p. 1675.

menced by miracles, nourished by hope, augmented by charity, confirmed by antiquity, holds me. The succession of Bishops from the See itself of Peter the Apostle, to whom the LORD after His Resurrection commended His sheep to be fed, even down to the present Episcopate, hold me. Lastly, the name itself of 'Catholic' holds me, which not without reason amidst so many heresies this Church alone hath in such wise obtained, that, when all heretics wish themselves to be called Catholics, yet to any stranger inquiring Where do they assemble at the Catholic Church? none of them would dare to point out his own *basilica* or house."<sup>a</sup>

Bellarmino proposes fifteen Notes of the Church: "First, the very name of 'Catholic Church' and of 'Christians.' 2. Antiquity. 3. Long and uninterrupted duration. 4. Amplitude or multitude and variety of believers. 5. Succession of Bishops in the Roman Church derived from the Apostles down to our time. 6. Agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church. 7. Union of members among themselves, and with the head, who is the Roman Pontiff. 8. Holiness of doctrine. 9. Efficacy of doctrine. 10. Holiness of life of the authors and first fathers of our religion. 11. Glory of miracles. 12. Light of Prophecy. 13. Confession of adversaries. 14. The unhappy end of those who assail the Church. 15. Temporal felicity divinely bestowed on those who defend the Church."<sup>v</sup> Of these Notes I think it sufficient to say, with Hooker: "Whereupon because the *only object* which separateth ours from other religions is JESUS CHRIST, in Whom none but the Church doth believe and Whom none but the Church doth worship, we find that accordingly the Apostles do everywhere distinguish hereby the Church from infidels and from Jews, accounting 'them which call upon the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST' to be His Church. If we go lower we shall but add unto this certain casual and variable accidents, which are not properly of the being, but make only for the happier and better being of the Church of GOD, either in deed, or in men's opinions and conceits. This is the error

<sup>a</sup> S. Aug. Contra Epistolam Manichæi, Tom. VIII. p. 153.

<sup>v</sup> Condensed from Bellarmin. De Notis Ecclesiæ, Lib. iv. Ed. Colon. Agripp. 1620.

of all Popish definitions that have hitherto been brought. They define not the Church by that which the Church essentially is, but by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect than the rest are." <sup>w</sup> Anglicans sometimes dream of a prosperous future for their Church, which shall enable her to emulate the pretensions of the Church of Rome. But, observe, no amount of success can ever invest Canterbury with the dignity of an Apostolic See. And, as Pope Leo XIII. remarks (A.D. 1885,) not even Protestant Powers address the Bishop of Rome as other than a Sovereign. But the true sway over souls belongs, not to external order, but "to those who leave the impression of having vanquished nature by grace, of having traversed the burning bush, and of speaking the language of the Divine Will." (H. F. Amiel, *Journal Intime*, Tom. II. p. 58.)

Of the Infallibility and Indefectibility of the Church.

§. 5. The question of the Infallibility of the Church Catholic seems to hinge on the concomitant fact of its Indefectibility. For, if we call to mind the definition of what the Church is, we cannot allow that the Catholic Church either can cease to exist or cease to hold and teach the essential truths of the Gospel, without denying the SAVIOUR'S declaration that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." <sup>x</sup> If we assert that at any time the visible Church hath failed, we announce that CHRIST is at some period a Head without His Body; <sup>y</sup> and that "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," <sup>z</sup> falls from its privileges, and is converted into a "synagogue of Satan." <sup>a</sup> If we say that the Church ceases not to exist, but may at certain periods cease to teach saving truths, we deny S. Paul's assertion that it is the pillar and ground of the truth, and allow that the gates of hell have indeed prevailed against it, notwithstanding the promise of CHRIST. And yet it is maintained of several churches, as those of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, that they have "erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." <sup>b</sup> This can only be understood of *some*

<sup>w</sup> Eccles. Polity, Bk. v. ch. 68, §. 6; Vol. II. p. 369, Ed. Keble, 1841.

<sup>x</sup> S. Matt. xvi. 18.

<sup>y</sup> Col. i. 18.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 15.

<sup>a</sup> Rev. ii. 9.

<sup>b</sup> Article XIX.

matters of Faith, not of *all*; for it would be impossible to show that any of those churches or communions ever *synodically* or *corporately* decided in terms against any one article of Faith contained in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. It must be observed then that "the Universal Church is One, although it hath many members; whence all particular churches are members of the Universal Church, which consists in the sum total of the Faithful, as many branches proceed out of one tree and many members out of one body. And this is that Church, which cannot err, that is, the aggregate of all the Faithful; neither can it fail, because GOD prayed for the Church."\* S. Cyril of Jerusalem gives a reason for the Church's being termed Catholic, "because it teaches universally and indefectibly (*καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλειπῶς*) all the doctrines that ought to come to men's knowledge concerning things in heaven and things on earth."<sup>d</sup> And Pope Felix III., quoting S. Peter's confession, seems to limit this doctrinal infallibility of the Church to the terms, whereupon the promise of CHRIST was originally granted; "the SAVIOUR having said, that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, to the extent of taking out of her His Name, which hath been mentioned, CHRIST JESUS and SON of Almighty God."<sup>e</sup>

The infallibility of the Catholic Church in matters necessary to salvation is involved in the proof of her visible existence and continuity from the Apostles; and her indefectibility is thus maintained by the Catholic Bishops of Africa against the Donatists. "As we do not believe that the dead body of CHRIST perished from the sepulchre by any person's theft; so we ought not to believe that His living members have perished from the world by any one's sin. It is not therefore difficult, since CHRIST is the Head and the Church the Body, to see commended together in the Gospel both the Head against the calumnies of the Jews and the Body against the false charges of heretics. For that which is read, 'Thus it behoved CHRIST to suffer and to rise from the dead the

\* S. John xvii. 20, 21.—Panor-  
mitan. super i. Part i. Decret. p.  
13.

<sup>d</sup> Cateches. xviii.

<sup>e</sup> τοῦ ἐξῆραι ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὴν αὐτοῦ  
ἐκωνυμίαν. Felicis P.P. iii. Epist.  
5, ad Zenonem Imperatorem, ap.  
Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1069.



third day,'<sup>f</sup> is against those who say that when dead He was taken away from the sepulchre: but that which follows, 'And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem,'<sup>g</sup> is against those who say that there is no Church in the world; that by one brief text both the enemy of the Head and the enemy of the Body may be repelled and corrected."<sup>h</sup> But, granting that indefectibility and infallibility can only be safely predicated of the Church Catholic in its universality, every approach that is made in practice to the realization of the ideal in its portions and in particular Churches should serve as an incentive to those in authority to aim at compassing it in its fulness. "Apostolic discipline has arranged that there ought to be one confession of Catholic Bishops. If then there is one faith, there ought also to remain one tradition. If there is one tradition, one discipline ought to be maintained throughout all Churches. Churches have indeed been settled in different regions, but throughout the world it is called one Church by unity of the Catholic Faith."<sup>i</sup> Modern circumstances do not admit of the simple solution implied by S. Augustine, that of popular phraseology. (See above, §. 4.) If in some places it would indicate Rome, in Wales it would point to the Established Church, in London possibly to the Irvingite *basilica*. We cannot now "send any man to the Catholic Church by sending him to his own Church; which, *by holding communion with the whole Church*, must needs stand distinguished from those which hold it not, though under the name of Churches." (*Thornd.* Bk. III. c. 32. §. 50.)

§. 6. Among the Notes of the Church I think that of Miracles deserves especial and serious attention. For it is written of the first preachers of the Gospel; "And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the LORD working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."<sup>j</sup> And, as large and important sections of Christendom lay claim to the *present* exercise of thaumaturgic powers, and

Of the Note  
of Miracles.

<sup>f</sup> S. Luke xxiv. 46.

<sup>g</sup> v. 47.

<sup>h</sup> Collatio Carthag. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1354.

<sup>i</sup> Canones Romanorum ad Gallos  
Episcopos missi, Can. vii. *ap.* Labbe.  
Tom. II. p. 1319.

<sup>j</sup> S. Mark xvi. 20.

insist on the possession of such powers as a normal condition of the True Church, and therefore as properly entering into any definition thereof, while Protestant Divines generally assume the cessation of miracles consequently upon the death of the Apostles or their immediate disciples; it cannot be unnecessary to examine more minutely the question, Whether miracles were performed after the Apostolic age? and if so, Whether the possession of thaumaturgic powers is an inalienable property of the Catholic Church?

I will assume, then, that the early writers of Christianity are trustworthy witnesses; and that, when they commit themselves to categorical statements of what they themselves saw or heard, their testimony is at the very least entitled to as much credit as that which we willingly accord to other writers of past times. S. Justin Martyr speaks of devils, that "even at this day they are subject, when exorcised by the Name of JESUS CHRIST, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate the sometime Procurator of Judæa." \* S. Irenæus writes: "It is impossible to tell the number of the graces, which throughout the whole world the Church receiving from GOD in the Name of CHRIST JESUS crucified under Pontius Pilate accomplishes daily for the help of the nations, neither seducing anyone, nor taking money from him. For as she has received of GOD freely, freely also she ministers." † Again; "Even as we have also heard many brethren in the Church, having Prophetical gifts (*charismata*), and through the SPIRIT speaking in all tongues, and declaring in public the secrets of men for a useful purpose, and revealing the mysteries of God; whom the Apostle also calls *spiritual*." ‡ Origen declares; "Even now the Name of JESUS removes from men mental disturbances, and devils, and moreover diseases; and produces in them a wonderful mildness and subdued manner and benevolence and kindness and gentleness." § Again; among the Jews, he says, "there are no longer prophets or wonders, whereof even traces to some extent are found among Christians (*ὅν καὶ ἰχνη ἐπὶ ποσὸν παρὰ*

\* Dialog. cum Tryphone, p. 247.

† *Ibid.* Lib. v. c. 5, p. 441.

‡ *Adversus Hæreses*, Lib. ii. c. 57, p. 218.

§ *Contra Celsum*, Lib. i. p. 54.

Χριστιανοῖς εὕρίσκεται); and certain greater things at least have we seen too, if we may be believed when we say so."° Again; "And some show in those they cure signs of having received something more wonderful by reason of this faith; invoking nothing else over those who need cure but the Supreme God and the Name of JESUS, with the history respecting Him. For these persons have we too seen, many of them, delivered from cruel mishaps and transports and frenzies and other innumerable (maladies), which neither men nor demons have cured." p

S. Augustine, at a much later period, writes without a shadow of hesitation about the miracles which were being performed in his day by the intercession of the Martyrs; and no one will pretend that Augustine's intellect was feeble or prone to superstitious fancies, or that his motives may be impeached on the score of hierarchical interests. Writing to the colder intellect of the North, I may not dissemble that an African probably shared the perfervid genius of his countrymen. "Hence," he says, writing to Paulinus, "that question is also solved, How do the Martyrs by the very benefits granted to those that pray indicate that they engage in human affairs, if the dead know not what the living do? For not by the sole effects of benefits, but also that the confessor Felix appeared to the very sight of men, when Nola was besieged by the Barbarians, we have heard not by uncertain rumours, but by sure witnesses. But those things are divinely exhibited far otherwise than according to the accustomed order attributed to various creatures. For (it holds) not, because, when the LORD willed, water was suddenly converted into wine, (that) we ought not to distinguish the capacity of water in the proper order of elements from the singularity of that Divine operation: nor, inasmuch as Lazarus rose again, therefore doth every dead man rise again when he wills, or is a lifeless man roused by a living one, as he that sleeps is by him that wakes. Other are the limits of human things, other the signs of Divine virtues; other are the things done naturally, other those which are done marvellously; although GOD is present with Nature for it to exist, and Nature is not wanting to

• *Ibid.* Lib. ii. p. 63.

• *Ibid.* Lib. iii. p. 128.

miracles. It is not then on that account to be supposed, that any defunct persons you please may engage in the affairs of the living, because the Martyrs are present to heal or aid some: but rather is it therefore to be understood, that through Divine power the Martyrs assist in the affairs of the living, since the departed cannot through their own power be thus present."<sup>a</sup>

Whether miracles continued in the Church in later times admits of no satisfactory solution. For on the one hand, while no logical reason can be assigned for their cessation, when circumstances arose that seemed to require such intervention of Divine Providence even more than at the commencement of the Gospel; (for can it be maintained, that miracles were *less* imperatively required for the conversion of the Barbarians of the North than for that of the civilised subjects of the Roman Empire, who were from education open to dialectical proof and argument?) on the other hand, a constant succession of miracles would go far to deprive them of that *extraordinary* character, wherein lay their value. Thus we find the Author of the Treatise *De Sacramentis*, included in the works of S. Ambrose, and which is found in a Manuscript of the Abbey of S. Gall pronounced by Mabillon to be older than the seventh century,<sup>r</sup> speaking as if miracles had ceased; "But on us now the prerogative of faith is bestowed; for in the beginning signs were wrought for unbelievers; now in the fulness of the Church we gather the Truth not by miracle but by faith."<sup>s</sup> Another writer of that age (A.D. 584,) Licinianus bishop of Carthage, in a letter to Vincentius bishop of Yvica, blames him for too easily accepting a pretended miraculous letter from heaven: "Far be it then from your Holiness to believe this, that an Epistle should now be sent to us from CHRIST. For let that suffice which He hath spoken in the Prophets, by Himself, and by His Apostles. Believe not therefore what is not read to have been ever done; what, even though it

<sup>a</sup> De Cura gerenda pro Mortuis, §. 19, Opp. Tom. VI. p. 528.

<sup>r</sup> In Præfat. ad S. Maximi Episc.

Taurin. Homilias, Mus. Ital. Tom. I. p. 4. §. 2. p. 7, §. 16.

<sup>s</sup> Ap. S. Ambros. Opp. Tom. II. p. 358.

had been done, is now unnecessary after the preaching of the Gospel." †

But again, we are overwhelmed with an abundance of miracles, when we come to the times of Gregory the Great. I think that two circumstances will go some way to remove the difficulty: first, that he (Gregory) almost invariably quotes the testimony of others; and, secondly, that he was firmly convinced that CHRIST'S Second Coming was at hand, and therefore predisposed to interpret every marvellous and unaccountable incident as a special harbinger and token of His Advent. Thus he attempts to account for the strange stories about Purgatory, which were become so rife, and which he acknowledges to have been unknown previously. "Why is it, I pray you," asks Peter his Deacon, "that in these last times so many facts about souls are evident, which before were hidden; in such wise that the world to come seems to introduce itself to us by open revelations and proofs?" "So it is," replies Gregory; "for so far as the present world approaches to the faith, the future world is now touched and disclosed by clearer signs. For since in this world we by no means see our mutual thoughts, but in the other we behold our hearts alternately, what should I call this world but Night, and the future Day? But as when before sunrise darkness is somehow intermingled with light, until the relics of departing night be changed into the perfect light of succeeding day: so the end of this world is already being blended with the beginning of the future world, and the very darkness of its remains already reflects a certain mixture of things spiritual. And we now behold many things which are of that world, but do not yet know them perfectly; because we see them as if before sunrise in a twilight of the mind." ‡

It is urged as a rule, "That famous miracles were to be suspected for lying wonders, unless they had some special use or extraordinary end." § But this can hardly be safe; for thereby we constitute ourselves the judges of the 'special use'

† Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, De Scriptis Christo tributis*, Tom. I. p. 308.

‡ S. Gregor. Magni Dialog. Lib. iv. cap. 41.

§ Jackson, *Works*, Vol. I. p. 938.

or 'extraordinary end,' as though we were admitted into the secret cabinet of Providence and could penetrate the hidden springs of Divine action. It may well be that miracles are sometimes wrought to convince those who are blind to the usual witnesses of Providence, that the Most High "doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth : and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou ?" \* A safer rule will be found in the directly benevolent character which belongs in *general* to genuine Christian miracles. This is noticed by the Author of the *Recognitions of S. Clement*: "He who is from the Evil One, the signs which he doeth profit no one ; but those which the good man doeth profit men. For tell me I pray you, what avails it to show statues walking ? for dogs in brass or stone to bark ? mountains to leap ? to fly through the air ? and other things like these which ye say Simon (Magus) did ? But those which are from the Good are wrought to the saving of men ; as are those which our LORD did, Who made the blind to see, the deaf to hear ; raised the feeble and halt ; put to flight diseases and devils ; made the dead to rise again." † So Origen challenges comparison between the miracles of CHRIST and the marvels attributed to Aristeas of Proconnesus, and adds ; " See, if from the result and from those that are benefited to correction of manners and piety towards GOD you have not to allow that the things narrated of JESUS came not to pass without GOD ; but not so what is told of Aristeas of Proconnesus." ‡ We may note that Miracles are mostly intelligible modifications of matter, such as a reverent intellect may explain so far as to reconcile them with the works of the Creator in the natural order of things. He that bade the waters of the Red Sea to stand on an heap congealeth water into seas of ice. He who walked on the waves of the Sea of Galilee now developes the wonders of steam and electricity in the order of Nature. But He doth not assign to substances qualities foreign to their

\* Dan. iv. 35.

† *Recognitions S. Clementis*, Lib. iii. c. 60.

‡ *Contra Celsum*, Lib. iii. p. 130. Such also is the language of Ire-

næus ; "Secundum utilitates hominum, sed non ad seductionem perfecit." *Adv. Hæres. Lib. ii. c. 57*, p. 219.

nature. Hence I regard with distrust such miracles as that assigned to S. John, of converting rods into gold.

"Generally, Miracles," says Dr. Jackson, "were usual in the infancy of Christianity, as we read in Ecclesiastical stories: nor can it be certainly gathered when they did generally cease. To say they endured no longer than the Primitive Church can give no universal satisfaction, save only to such as think it enough for all the world to have the light of the Gospel locked up in the chancel of some one glorious church: for some Churches were but in the prime or change, when others were full of Christian knowledge. The use of miracles at the same instant was befitting the one, not the other."

I conclude with S. Augustine; "Albeit then the marvels of visible nature may have become cheap by the constant

\* Vol. I. p. 45.—He particularly classes as supernatural certain dreams in the early history of the Franks and Saxons. The fiery eruption which obstructed the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem under Julian has found believers among those who are disposed to reject ecclesiastical miracles. The case of the Confessors of Tipasa, whose tongues were cut off in the persecution of the African Catholics under Hunneric, A.D. 488, and who continued to speak without tongues, should be added. "This miracle," writes Gibbon, "is attested by Victor, an African bishop, who published a history of the persecution within two years after the event. At Constantinople we are astonished to find a cool, a learned, and unexceptionable witness, without interest, and without passion. *Æneas of Gaza*, a Platonic philosopher, has accurately described his own observations on these African sufferers. 'I saw them myself: I heard them speak: I diligently inquired by what means such an articulate voice could be formed without any organ of speech: I used my eyes to examine the report of my ears: I opened their mouth, and saw that the whole tongue had been completely torn away by the roots;

an operation which the physicians generally suppose to be mortal.' The testimony of *Æneas of Gaza* might be confirmed by the superfluous evidence of the Emperor Justinian, in a perpetual edict; of Count Marcellinus, in his Chronicle of the times; and of Pope Gregory the First, who had resided at Constantinople, as the minister of the Roman Pontiff. They all lived within the compass of a century; and they all appeal to their personal knowledge, or the public notoriety, for the truth of a miracle, which was repeated in several instances, displayed on the greatest theatre of the world, and submitted, during a series of years, to the calm examination of the senses." (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 37, Vol. iv. p. 434.) But observe how Tertullian argues against the possibility of such an occurrence: "An omnino credibile sit, tali membro desecto, vastato ipsius animæ organo, et utique rapiditus cæso, castratis faucibus, quæ etiam extrinsecus periculose vulnerantur, exinde tabo in præcordia refluxente, postremò aliquamdiu cessantibus alimentis, vitam nutriti perdurasse?" (*Ad Nationes*, Lib. I. c. 8.)

seeing thereof; yet, when we look at them with judgment, they are greater than the most unusual and most rare. For Man too is a greater marvel than any marvel wrought by man. Wherefore God, Who made heaven and earth visible, doth not disdain to work visible miracles in heaven or on earth, whereby He may excite the soul still given up to visible things to worship Him the Invisible. But when and where He doeth them, the unchangeable design is in His power, in Whose disposal times to come are already accomplished." \* I will add, that although such miracles as the crowning one of the Resurrection of CHRIST and His authentic works be 'infallible proofs' *to the believer*, they are external to Faith, which witnesses to 'things not seen.' Absolute proofs would convert Faith into Science. The evidence which convinced S. Thomas was not required by S. John, and would not have converted Judas. The history of Christianity and the existence of Israel as a nation without a Fatherland now supply 'proofs' unattainable in the ages when local 'miracles' occurred.

\* De Civitate Dei, Lib. x. c. 12, Tom. VII. p. 249.



## CHAPTER XVIII.

## OF PREDESTINATION.

Of God's  
dealings  
with his  
Elect,  
viewed ab-  
stractedly.

§. 1. HAVING treated of the Catholic Church as the visible home of God's Elect children in CHRIST, we come next to examine the invisible dealings of God with His Elect, viewed abstractedly and antecedently to consideration of any visible, external, or sacramental modes, whereby those eternal facts are manifested or made known to us in time. Without pretending to separate them from those conditions, accompanied by which we in point of fact are acquainted with them, nor tying them rigidly to those conditions excluding all other, it will be sufficient to notice, that, as we sometimes distinguish the Elect from the Catholic Church without intending to insinuate that they are in fact a separate class, but rather the true spiritual essence of the Catholic Church; so we may discuss separately the abstract spiritual facts of Predestination, Election, Justification, and Sanctification, without denying that Baptism is the Sacrament of Justification, and the Eucharist that of Sanctification. For if to be justified is to have the Blood of the Eternal Victim the Lamb of God applied to the purifying both of body and soul, how shall it be denied that That Blood is applied in holy Baptism, "that He might sanctify and cleanse (the Church) with the washing of water by the word?"<sup>b</sup> Or, again, how shall it be denied that Justification, as a spiritual fact, though coincident with Baptism *duly received*, yet covers more ground? inasmuch as it is not only a past but also a present fact, applicable not only in Baptism, but in Penance, or in inward Contrition, or in the Eucharist, as long as ever the Atoning Blood may be

<sup>b</sup> Eph. v. 26.

applied, short of a person's reprobation; as S. John saith, "But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of JESUS CHRIST His SON *cleanseth* us from all sin." <sup>c</sup> And this I conceive to be one of the chief reasons of the difficulty, wherewith the Church's teaching concerning Baptismal Regeneration is received; because many persons, finding the great doctrine of Justification by Faith limited as it were to the Sacrament which is its chief exponent, and that Sacrament applied to unconscious infants in whom the Divine gift of Faith (if given in Baptism) is certainly dormant, and cannot be shown by its fruits to have been given at all to some adults; finding, moreover, the 'godly discipline' of 'open Penance' and open Absolution of Penitents utterly in abeyance; and the doctrine of the Eucharist as a perpetual Sacrifice, wherein the merits of the One Sacrifice accomplished in blood on Calvary are ever applied to "the remission of sins," either imperfectly taught or openly denied; such persons, I say, naturally refuse to treat Justification as a past historical fact connected with *Infant Baptism* only. Post-Baptismal sin is to them an "intolerable burden." A beautiful picture of the effects of Justification and Regeneration in Baptism, drawn perhaps from the fervid language of some Primitive Saint, in whose time Adult Baptism was as common as that of Infants, and when the Discipline of the Church and the Power of the Keys was in full vigour; is but a cruel mockery to those who "acknowledge and bewail their manifold sins and wickedness, which they from time to time most grievously have committed by thought, word, and deed, against the Divine Majesty!" They need a present SAVIOUR; to Whom, even after Baptism, "if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." <sup>d</sup> And the convictions of the spiritual heart, which hath "tasted of the heavenly gift and been made partaker of the HOLY GHOST," <sup>e</sup> refuse to be satisfied with a meagre Theology, which reduces Regeneration to a mere titular investiture and strips Justification of its present energy.

<sup>c</sup> S. John i. 7.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. vi. 4.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* i. 9.

Again, that the Eucharist is the Sacrament of Sanctification is clear from the words of the Church, which prays that we may so "eat the Flesh of JESUS CHRIST and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood."<sup>f</sup> But it is also clear that the work of "God the HOLY GHOST, Who sanctifieth all the elect people of God,"<sup>g</sup> is not confined to any one Sacrament or Ordinance. I therefore propose to treat here of the Grace of GOD to His Elect; antecedently to the consideration of those Sacraments, "which be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us;"<sup>h</sup> and first, of Predestination.

Of the definition of Predestination.

§. 2. "In this matter," writes Augustine, "let not the Church wait for laborious disputations, but pay heed to her daily prayers. She prays that unbelievers may believe: it is GOD then that converts to the faith. She prays that believers may persevere: it is GOD then that grants perseverance unto the end. These things GOD hath foreknown that He would do. It is the very Predestination of the Saints, whom He hath chosen in CHRIST before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and immaculate before Him in love: predestinating them unto the adoption of sons by JESUS CHRIST to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made them accepted in His beloved SON, in Whom they have redemption through His Blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace; which hath abounded toward them in all wisdom and prudence; that He might show unto them the mystery of His will according to His good pleasure, which He had purposed in Him, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, to restore all things in CHRIST, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him, in Whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."<sup>i</sup>

<sup>f</sup> Communion Office.

<sup>g</sup> Catechism.

<sup>h</sup> Article XXV.

<sup>i</sup> Eph. i. 4—11. S. Aug. De  
Dono Perseverantiæ, c. 7, §. 15,  
Opp. Tom. X. p. 829.

To come closer to a definition: "This is the Predestination of the Saints, nothing else; to wit, the foreknowledge and preparation of God's benefits, whereby they are most certainly saved whosoever are saved."<sup>j</sup>

By a nice distinction Augustine confines the meaning of Predestination to those things which God foreknoweth that Himself will do in time. Thus: "No one then who understands this is permitted to deny or doubt, that, where the Apostle saith, 'God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew,'<sup>k</sup> he meant predestination. For God foreknew the remnant which He Himself was going to make according to the election of grace. This then is, He predestined; for doubtless He foreknew, if He predestined; but to have predestined is to have foreknown that which He Himself was going to do."<sup>l</sup> "Between Grace moreover and Predestination this only is the difference, that Predestination is the preparation of Grace, but Grace is already the grant itself. What then the Apostle saith, 'Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in CHRIST JESUS unto good works,'<sup>m</sup> is Grace; but what follows, 'which God hath prepared that we should walk in them,' is Predestination, which cannot be without foreknowledge; but foreknowledge may be without predestination. \* \* Wherefore God's Predestination which concerns good is, as I said, the preparation of Grace; but Grace is the effect of Predestination."<sup>n</sup>

The African Bishops, exiled into Sardinia about A.D. 521, say: "It is a matter of great obstinacy for any one to contend against the Predestination of the Saints; since no one may venture to oppose the Apostolical preaching, wherein it is not only said of the LORD, 'For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His SON,'<sup>o</sup> and in another place, 'Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by JESUS CHRIST to Himself;'<sup>p</sup> but the blessed Paul confidently proclaims our Head Himself, the

<sup>j</sup> *Ibid.* c. 14, §. 35, p. 839.

<sup>k</sup> Rom. xi. 2.

<sup>l</sup> *Ibid.* c. 18, §. 47, p. 848.

<sup>m</sup> Eph. ii. 9, 10.

<sup>n</sup> S. Aug. De Prædestinatione Sanctorum, c. x. §. 19, T. X. p. 803.

<sup>o</sup> Rom. viii. 29.

<sup>p</sup> Eph. i. 5.

First-born among many brethren, to have been predestinated, saying ; ‘ Which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh ; and predestinated to be the SON of GOD by miracle, according to the Spirit of holiness.’<sup>a</sup> Whosoever therefore denies that CHRIST was predestinated and His Saints, perversely impugns the Apostolic Faith. But all they are predestinated, whom He willeth to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. Who are for that reason called *all*, because they are saved in either sex, out of every kind, grade, age, and condition of men. For the will of Almighty GOD is ever being fulfilled, because His power is to no extent overcome. For it is He that hath made all things whatsoever He pleased in heaven and on earth, in the sea and in all deep places, and Whose will no man resists. And that is true, which His SON hath testified concerning Him, that in quickening men He waits not for any beginning of human will, but quickens the will itself by making it good. This is the case in adults. But infants, in whom a good will cannot yet operate, He saves by the operation of Grace alone.”<sup>r</sup>

One true  
Predestina-  
tion to  
Grace and  
Glory.

§. 3. Some have sought to establish a distinction between Predestination to Grace and Predestination to Glory, from a supposed contrast of clauses in S. Paul’s description, as quoted above. Thus Gratian in the Canon Law : “ As it is given us to understand from the premised authority of the Apostle, there be two pre-ordinations ; one, whereby a person is pre-ordained here to receive righteousness and remission of sins ; another, whereby a person is pre-ordained to obtain eternal life in future. The effects of these are present justification and future glorification ; which are all conveniently distinguished in the premised authority. For the first Predestination, whereby persons are pre-ordained to present righteousness, is designated, when it is said ‘ As He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world ; ’ the effect of which is placed below, ‘ Wherein He hath made us accepted in His Beloved SON.’ The second pre-ordination is here shown, ‘ Predestinating us unto the adoption of sons.’ Its effect is premised, when it is said, ‘ Who hath blessed us

<sup>a</sup> Rom. i. 3, 4.

<sup>r</sup> Epist. Synodica Epp. African-

orum, ap. Labbe. Tom. IV. pp. 1598, 1599.

with all spiritual blessings.'"<sup>\*</sup> Thorndike, whom I take to represent the sentiment current in the Anglican Church for two centuries past, insists that S. Paul speaks of the predestination "not of men to be saved, but of Christians to bear the cross of CHRIST." (*Of the Cov. of Gr. c. XXVI. §. 5.*) But they who truly bear the cross are they who are being saved, and presumably the Elect whom God hath predestinated. Unless we assume that God predestinates gifts only, not recipients. Doth not the popular ideal of 'the true Christian' in sermons and discourse witness to the consciousness of Election as personal?

But more profound writers make no such distinction; as, for instance, Bradwardine, who defines Predestination to be "the eternal preparation by the Divine Will of final grace on his way and of everlasting beatitude in his home<sup>†</sup> for a rational creature."<sup>‡</sup> Nor do the African Fathers, above quoted; nor does Augustine scruple to deal with those as Reprobates, to whom his already cited definition of Predestination will not apply. Thus; "But where are the rest left by a just Divine judgment except in the mass of perdition? Where they of Tyre and Sidon were left, who also might have believed, if they had seen those wonderful signs of CHRIST. But since it had not been granted them to believe, the ground of belief was also denied them. Whence it appears that some have in their very intellect naturally a Divine gift of understanding, whereby they are moved to faith, if they either hear words or see signs congruous to their minds. And yet, if by God's deeper judgment they have not been separated from the mass of perdition by the predestination of grace, neither are the Divine words nor the facts themselves applied to them, whereby they might believe, if to be sure they were to hear or see such things. In the same mass of perdition have the Jews also been left, who could not believe so great and clear miracles done in their sight. For as to why they could not believe, the Gospel has not been silent, saying; 'But though He had done so many miracles before them, yet

<sup>\*</sup> Decreti, 2 Pars, Caus. xxxiii. qu. 3, De Pœnit. Dist. iv. c. 11, p. 1082.

<sup>†</sup> *Patria*; cf. Heb. xi. 14, 16.

<sup>‡</sup> *Ap. Franc. à S. Clara: Deus, Natura, Gratia*, p. 3.

they believed not on Him: that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, LORD, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the LORD been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.' The eyes then of them of Tyre and Sidon were not so blinded, nor their hearts so hardened, but that they would have believed, if they had seen such signs as the Jews saw. But it did not profit them too that they might have believed; because they had not been predestinated by Him, Whose judgments are unsearchable and His ways past finding out. Nor would it have hindered them, if they could not have believed; if they had been so predestinated, that God should illuminate them being blind, and should will to take away their stony heart from them being hardened." \* Language in accord with this doctrine occurs commonly in mediæval Lives of the Saints, (*Sanctorale Catholicum*, p. 311;) and only ceased when the Latin Church saw the hated image of Calvin projected in the like. Leibniz tells Father Des Bosses (a Jesuit) plainly; "I fear lest much that is blamed in Jansenius belong to Augustine himself." (*Epist.* 18.) On this head I again differ from Thorndike, to whose elaborate statements I refer the reader who is dissatisfied with mine. (*Of the Cov. of Gr.* c. XXVI. §. 1.) But he admits that God's effectual provision of grace must take rise at His own free choice. And that the events of Providence, if imputable to the choice of the creature, must spring from the Maker's secret dispensation thereof (c. XXV.) We assist at the revolution of a circle, and behold a gulf man's wit may not fathom. If GOD qualifies some for salvation by granting them 'effectual grace,' which He refuses others, granting them meanwhile 'sufficient grace,' doth this distinction really remove the difficulty, that GOD doth not reveal His secret counsel in the dispensation of grace?

It is a strange notion, that "GOD doth not appoint man to glory, till He see that he hath used His grace as he should

\* S. Aug. De Dono Perseverantiæ, c. 14, §. 35. Tom. X. p. 840.

do." (*Just Weights*, c. XIII. §. 3.) Doth God then predestinate *in time*, or from everlasting? Nor doth it move me to hear that a Predestination antecedent to, but yet implying conditions, seems to preclude *persuasion*. Leibniz's theory of pre-established Harmony helps here, as it did help Suarez to conceive the success of the prayers of the Saints.

§. 4. Against this view of Predestination, which the Western Church following S. Augustine has accepted as orthodox, the Gallican party of John Cassian, Faustus of Riez, and others, afterwards termed Semi-Pelagian, objected; first, that Predestination depended on God's foreknowledge of human merit or obedience. Their proposition was, "That, when Adam sinned, every man sinned. And that no man is saved by his own works but by God's grace of regeneration. That to all men however without exception the Atonement, which is in the Sacrament of the Blood of CHRIST, is set forth; so that whosoever willeth to come to faith and baptism may be saved. But that God foreknew before the foundation of the world those that should believe and remain in that faith which was afterwards to be assisted through grace, and hath predestinated them to His kingdom; whom being called freely He hath foreseen, that they will be worthy of their election, and will depart out of this life by a good end. And that therefore every man is admonished by the Divine Word to believe and to labour, that no one may despair of apprehending life, since remuneration is prepared for voluntary devotion." <sup>w</sup> Augustine replies; "Let them hear Paul himself in this testimony, where he saith, 'In Whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will.' <sup>x</sup> He then Who worketh all things worketh that we should begin to believe. Inasmuch as that vocation, whereof it is said, 'For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,' <sup>y</sup> and whereof it is said 'Not of works, but of Him that calleth,' <sup>z</sup> when He might have said, 'But of him that believeth;' and the election, which the

Objection  
on the score  
of God's  
prescience  
of human  
merit or  
obedience.

<sup>w</sup> Epist. Prosperi ad Aug. *ap.*  
S. Aug. Opp. Tom. X. p. 779.  
<sup>z</sup> Eph. i. 11.

<sup>y</sup> Rom. xi. 29.  
<sup>x</sup> *Ibid.* ix. 11.



LORD hath signified, saying, 'Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you ;' <sup>a</sup> not even faith itself precedes. For not because we have believed, but that we may believe, hath He chosen us ; lest we should be said to have first chosen Him, and that should be false (which be it far from us !) 'Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you.' Nor are we called, because we have believed, but that we may believe ; and by that calling, which is without repentance, that is entirely done and accomplished, that we may believe." <sup>b</sup>

Objection  
on the score  
of necessity  
or of the  
arbitrary  
distinction  
of caste or  
classes.

§. 5. Again, they objected the difficulty arising from the arbitrary selection of individuals implied by Predestination, as though it appeared to introduce necessity or an arbitrary division of castes. Their proposition is thus stated by Prosper : "That this purpose of the calling of God, whereby a distinction of persons to be chosen or rejected is said to have been made either before the beginning of the world or in the very creation of mankind, so that according as it pleased the Creator some were created vessels of honour, others vessels of dishonour, both takes away from the fallen (all) concern about rising again, and brings to the Saints an occasion of lukewarmness ; for this reason, because on either side labour is superfluous, if neither the rejected can by any industry enter, nor the elect by any negligence fall away. For in whatever manner they conduct themselves, nothing can befall them otherwise than as GOD has determined ; and under an uncertain hope one's course cannot be steady ; since, if the election of the Predestinator is adverse, the intention of him who strives will be fruitless. And that so all industry is removed and virtues taken away, if GOD's constitution prevents human wills ; and under this name of Predestination a certain fatal necessity is induced ; or that the LORD is called the Creator of diverse natures, if no one can be anything else but what he was made." <sup>c</sup>

Origen appears to have anticipated the Semi-Pelagians here ; though he went further, and attributed the election or reprobation of individuals to their merits or demerits in a pre-existent state. He writes ; "But since the Apostle in what

<sup>a</sup> S. John xv. 16.

rum, c. 19. §. 38. p. 816.

<sup>b</sup> De Prædestinatione Sancto-

<sup>c</sup> Prosper, *ubi supra*.

he says of the vessels of honour or of dishonour, 'If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work,'<sup>d</sup> seems to place nothing in God, but all in ourselves: yet in this that he says, 'Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?'<sup>e</sup> seems to refer all unto God; we are not to take these passages contrary to each other, but to reconcile and make one sense out of them. That is, we should neither think what is in our disposal can be effected without God's aid, nor suppose that what is in God's hand is consummated without our action and purpose; to wit, in order that we should not now have in our power to will or effect anything, so as that we ought not to be aware, that this very power of ours to will and to accomplish has been given us by God."<sup>f</sup> He distinctly disclaims the teaching of the Valentinian school about an arbitrary *caste* distinction of *animal* and *spiritual* men; "What is that to us of the Church, that condemn those that introduce (the dogma of) souls saved from their constitution (*ἐκ κατασκευῆς*) and perishing likewise?"<sup>g</sup> "If this were now needful," urged the Semi-Pelagian, "that by not condemning all He might show what was due to all, and so more gratefully commend His grace to the vessels of mercy; why in the same matter should He punish me rather than another, or deliver him rather than me?"

The answer of Augustine shows his piety and caution. He does not allow himself to be driven to make concessions under pretence of vindicating the Divine justice, which would seem necessary, if we are to judge of Omniscience by our own limited standard. "I do not say this: if you ask why; because I confess I do not find what to say. If you also ask why so; because in this matter, as His anger is just, as His mercy is great, so are His judgments inscrutable."<sup>h</sup> "Of two infants then, equally bound by original sin, why the

<sup>d</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 21.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. ix. 21.

<sup>f</sup> Origen. *Peri Archon*, Lib. iii.

c. 1. p. 456.

<sup>g</sup> *Contra Celsum*, Lib. v. p. 279.

<sup>h</sup> *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, c. 8.

§. 18, p. 830.

one should be taken, the other left; and of two adults unrighteous persons, why the one should be so called as to follow Him that calls him, but the other should either not be called or not be so called; the judgments of GOD are inscrutable. But of two pious persons, why perseverance unto the end should be granted to the one, should not be granted to the other; the judgments of GOD are more inscrutable. This however should be most certain to the Faithful, that the one is of the Predestinated, the other is not. 'For if they had been of us,' saith one of the Predestinated, who had imbibed this secret from the LORD'S breast, 'they would no doubt have continued with us.'<sup>1</sup> What, I pray, is, 'They were not of us; for if they had been of us, 'they would no doubt have continued with us'? Were not both parties created by GOD, both born of Adam, both made of earth, and received souls of one and the same nature from Him Who said, 'The souls I have made?'<sup>2</sup> Lastly, were not both parties called, and did not both follow Him that called them; were not both justified from among the ungodly, and both renewed by the laver of regeneration? But if he were to hear this, who doubtless knew what he was saying, he might answer and say; 'This is true, according to all this they were of us; but nevertheless according to a certain other distinction they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.' What at length is that distinction? The books of GOD are open; let us not turn away our glance. The Divine Scripture calls; let us use our hearing. They were not of them, because they were not called according to His purpose; they had not been chosen in CHRIST before the foundation of the world; they had not obtained an inheritance in Him; they were not predestinated according to His purpose who worketh all things. For if they had been so, they would have been of them, and would no doubt have continued with them."<sup>3</sup> Leibniz argues that there is no absolute Reprobation, because GOD rejects men from His prevision of their final impenitence. If so, then He elects others from His prevision of their final perseverance in grace; a conse-

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. John ii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. lvii. 16.

<sup>3</sup> S. Aug. *ubi supra*, c. 9. §. 21, p. 831.

quence destructive of the freedom of His grace as taught by S. Paul.

I venture to point this out to show the impossibility of fathoming the mystery ; (compare *Théodicée*, Pt. I. §§. 81, 103) ; and am slow to accept his introduction of 'more favourable circumstances' as a factor in the case, lest we make Him Who is 'no respecter of persons' to be determined by circumstances. Enough that He, whose infinite love we have such crowning proofs of, must be trusted to reconcile Reprobation with the harmony of His universe. (*Causa Dei* &c. §. 138.)

Again he says : "Faith then both inchoate and perfect is the gift of God ; and that this gift is given to some, to some is not given, let him not doubt at all who would not withstand most evident Scriptures. But why it is not given to all ought not to move a believer, who believes that from one man all went into condemnation, doubtless a most just one ; so that there would be no just blame of God, even if none were thence delivered. Whence it is agreed that the grace is great, in that very many are delivered. But why He should deliver this person rather than that, His judgments are unsearchable and His ways past finding out. For here too we had better say, 'O man, who art thou that repliest against God?'<sup>1</sup> than venture to say, as if we knew, what He hath chosen to be secret, Who yet cannot have willed anything unjust."<sup>m</sup>

Again : "Recall it then to the hidden judgments of God, when ye see in one object-matter, (which at least all infants have, deriving hereditary evil from Adam,) that one is helped so as to be baptized ; that the other is not helped, so that he dies under his obligation : that the one being baptized is left in this life, whom God hath foreknown that he will be ungodly ; that the other being baptized is snatched out of this life, 'lest that wickedness should alter his understanding.'<sup>n</sup> And do not in these instances attribute unrighteousness or folly to God, with Whom is the well of righteousness and wisdom ; but whereto ye have already attained, walk in it, and God shall reveal even this unto you ; and if not in

<sup>1</sup> Rom. ix. 20.

§. 16, p. 801.

<sup>m</sup> De Prædest. Sanctorum, c. 8,

<sup>n</sup> Wisd. iv. 11.

this life, at least in another; 'for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed.'"<sup>o</sup> Let us dwell here on the profound thought of Cardinal Cajetan, that herein is some secret either in regard to the relation existing between God and the event or to that which connects the event with His prevision. Our spirit rests not on the evidence of the known, but on the inaccessible depth of the hidden Truth. Calvin too declares that God hath reasons *unknown to us* for reprobating some. (Leibniz, *Théodicée*.)

Durandus well illustrates the difficulty of accounting for the Reprobation of particular persons, when at the same time we may be able to see that the general fact squares with the designs of Providence. Thus: "The cause of Predestination in particular cannot be rendered, *although it may be rendered in general*."<sup>p</sup> For it belongs not to the perfection of the universe or to the representation of Divine perfection, that this person should be saved and that damned, more than the converse. But of this a double example is set, one in artificial, the other in natural things. For in things artificial we see, that a reason may well be rendered, why a potter makes out of the same mass some vessels unto honour, that is, to honourable uses, but makes others to dishonour and vile uses, because the perfection of the house, which needs either, requires this; but no reason can be rendered, why out of this part of the mass he makes a vessel unto honour, and out of another makes a vessel unto dishonour, when the whole mass according to itself is alike and uniform, none, save the will alone of the artificer. In like manner in things natural, because the perfection of the universe well requires, that some portion of matter should be in the form of water and another in that of air, otherwise those elements would not be, and then the universe would not be perfect; yet no reason can be

<sup>o</sup> S. Matt. x. 26.—S. Aug. De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, c. 23. §. 45. Tom. X. p. 743.

<sup>p</sup> See above, chap. x. §. 5, p. 212; and S. Prosper; "Neque enim quamlibet innumerabilis multitudo impiorum indecora est mundo, aut inutilis Dei regno; cum etiam per ipsorum veniat propaginem rege-

neranda generatio, et in eis tolerandis ac diligendis populus Dei fiat illustrior; discens bonitatem et patientiam ab Illo, qui pluit super justos et injustos, et solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos." Responsiones ad capitula Gallo-rum, §. 14, *ad calcem* S. Aug. Opp. Tom. X. p. 207.

rendered, why this part of matter should be in the form of water, and that part in that of air, save the sole will of God the Creator. In like manner also a reason may be rendered in general, why God hath from eternity chosen and predestinated some but not others, because this pertains to the perfection of the universe and to the fuller representation of Divine perfection; but in special, why He has chosen and predestinated this person and not that, no reason can be rendered beside the mere will of God. Wherefore Augustine saith, 'Let tongue of man be silent, nor be lifted up at all on the side of merits; since this is the gift of the Divine Will, not the merit of human frailty.'"<sup>a</sup> But because we may render a reason in general for Predestination and Election and their logical consequence Reprobation, but not a reason in special cases, we are silently warned not to measure Divine schemes of mercy; and may cherish a hope that more actually existing in the universal order of things *is well* than some suppose. I cannot conceive final and absolute Reprobation taking effect, save where the last spark of Divine love hath been wilfully quenched by the creature. It should be ever remembered that God is kinder than men. (Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*, IV. c. 18.)

§. 6. It was further objected, that "the defining of Predestination was adverse to the utility of preaching, in that when this is heard no one can be stimulated to correct himself." "In saying this," says Augustine, "they are unwilling we should preach, that it is God's gift that we come to faith and continue in faith; lest more of despair than of exhortation be brought, when the hearers think, that to human ignorance it is uncertain to whom God grants, to whom He doth not grant these gifts. Why then do they themselves along with us preach, that wisdom and continence are gifts of God? But if, while these are proclaimed to be God's gifts, we are not hindered from exhorting men to be wise and continent; what at length is the cause that they should think us hindered from exhorting men to come to faith and to continue in it to the end, if these too are said to

Objection drawn from the danger of preaching it.

<sup>a</sup> In Sent. Lib. i. Dist. 41, qu. 2, §. 14.

be the gifts of GOD, which is proved by Scriptures that attest it? As then, by the witness of the Divine sayings and by that of our very actions, which they (the objectors) share with us, the unquiet are to be rebuked; nor does it hinder this rebuke, that we proclaim the peaceable wisdom, whereby the contentious are corrected, to be the gift of GOD: so are unbelievers or such as continue not in faith to be rebuked, the preaching of GOD's grace, which commends faith itself and the continuance therein as GOD's gifts, not hindering that rebuking. Because, although wisdom is obtained of faith; as James himself, when he had said, 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of GOD, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him;' presently added, 'But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering:'<sup>r</sup> yet because faith is given, before that it is asked by him to whom it is given, it is not therefore to be said not to be the gift of GOD but to be from us, because it is given to us when we ask not for it. For the Apostle saith most openly, 'Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from GOD the FATHER and the LORD JESUS CHRIST.'<sup>s</sup> From Whom then are peace and charity, from Him is faith. Wherefore we ask that it be not only augmented by Him to those that have it, but also that it be given to those that have it not."<sup>t</sup>

Objection  
on the  
ground of  
its being un-  
known to  
earlier  
writers.

§. 7. Lastly, it was objected, that "what is now produced from the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans to the manifestation of Divine grace preventing the merits of the Elect was never so understood by any Churchmen, as it is now felt to mean;" and that "when the opinions of former writers on this subject are re-handled, the sentiment of almost all is found one and alike, whereby they received the purpose and predestination of GOD (to be) according to prescience; that on this account GOD hath made some vessels of honour, others vessels of dishonour, because He hath foreseen the end of each person, and hath foreknown in what condition of will and action he would be under the very aid of grace."<sup>u</sup> To give an instance of this line of argument, I quote Arnobius:

<sup>r</sup> S. James i. 5, 6.

<sup>s</sup> Eph. vi. 23.

<sup>t</sup> De Dono Perseverantiae, c. 17,

§§. 43, 44, pp. 845, 846.

<sup>u</sup> Prosperi Epist. ap. Aug. X.

779, 783.

“ But if (ye say) CHRIST is come the SAVIOUR of mankind, why does He not with equal munificence deliver all alike? Doth He not deliver equally, who calleth all equally? He doth not repel or reject any one from His princely indulgence, Who affords power of coming to Him uniformly to high and low, to slaves, women, and children. The well of life is open to all, He saith, nor is any one repelled from the right of drinking. If you are so fastidious as to reject the benefit of the proffered gift; moreover, if you so prevail in wisdom, as to call what is offered by CHRIST play and folly, is it the fault of the inviter, Whose sole business it is to expose the fruit of His benignity to your own right of choice?”<sup>v</sup>

But to this I would oppose the weighty language of Augustine himself: “ What need is there then to search their works, who, before that this heresy (of Pelagius) arose, had no necessity to engage on this question difficult of solution? which they doubtless would have done, if they were compelled to answer such persons. Whence it came to pass, that what they thought touching GOD’s grace they briefly and cursorily touched in some passages of their writings; but dwelt on those points which they disputed against the enemies of the Church, and on exhortations to every virtue, whereby we serve the living and true GOD for the obtaining of eternal life. But by the celebrations of prayers it simply appeared of what value was the grace of GOD; for what He commands should be done would not be asked of GOD, unless it were given by Him to be done.”<sup>w</sup> “ What hinders us then,” he asks, “ when we read of GOD’s prescience in certain tractators of the Word of GOD, and when they treat of the calling of the Elect, from understanding the same (as) Predestination? For perhaps they rather wished to use that word in that subject, because it both is more easily understood, and is not repugnant to, yea, even agrees with, the truth which is preached concerning the Predestination of grace. This I know, *that no one could unless erring have disputed against that Predestination, which we maintain according to the Holy Scriptures.* I think however that to those who require the sentiments of

<sup>v</sup> Adversus Gentes, Lib. ii. p. 52.

<sup>w</sup> De Prædest. Sanctorum, c. 14, §. 27, Tom. X. p. 808.



tractators on this subject, the holy men Cyprian and Ambrose, whose so clear testimonies we have set down, ought to be sufficient; and for either purpose, that is, that they should thoroughly believe and thoroughly preach God's free grace, as it should be believed and preached; and should not fancy the same preaching adverse to that whereby we exhort the slow and rebuke the evil. Since these persons too, when they so preached God's grace, that one of them said, 'We should glory in nothing, since nothing is ours;' \* and the other, 'Our heart is not in our power nor our thoughts,' † did not however desist from exhorting and rebuking, that the Divine precepts might be done. Nor did they fear, lest it should be said to them, Why do ye exhort us? Why too do ye rebuke us, since nought of good that we should have it is ours, and if our heart is not in our power? Lest this should be said to them, those holy men could by no means have feared, understanding as they did that to very few hath it been granted, that without any man's preaching to them they should receive the doctrine of salvation by means of God Himself or of the Angels of heaven; but that to many hath been granted to believe God by means of men. In whatever way however God's Word be told a man, doubtless, in order that he may so hear it as to obey it, it is the gift of God." ‡ Leibniz notices that the Schoolmen had on many points receded from the positions of Augustine; nor unadvisedly. (*Ad Des Bosses, epist. 8.*) I may instance the Saint's harsh judgment on the future state of infants dying unbaptized. He also fears that Augustine would be generally found of the same mind as Jansenius. But let it be borne in mind that on the very face of the matter the Schoolmen are the disciples of

\* Cyp. lib. iii. ad Quirinum, c. 4.

† Ambros. De Fuga seculi, c. 1.

‡ De Dono Perseverantie, c. 19, §. 48, p. 848. The authority of Augustine was soon acknowledged in the West, as may be seen by a letter of Pope Hormisdas to Possessor, an African bishop, A.D. 520. "De Arbitrio tamen libero et gratia Dei, quod Romana (hoc est Catholica) sequatur et asseveret Ecclesia, licet in variis libris beati Augustini,

et maxime ad Hilarium et Prosperum, possit cognosci; tamen in scriniis ecclesiasticis expressa capitula continentur." Hormisdæ P.P. Epist. 70, ap. Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1532. See also the Preface to this Work.—"L'opinion de S. Augustin, adoptée par les Conciles, par les Papes, par l'autorité civile, devient la doctrine générale de l'Eglise." Guizot, Histoire de la Civilisation en France, Tom. I. c. 5, p. 164.

Aristotle, Augustine the scholar of S. Paul. If they lean to common sense and reason in their judgments, he adheres to the super-natural, which is the mainstay of Faith. I would hope that the mysterious doctrines now handled admit of a wider application *in foro Divino*, sooner than accept the futile limitation of Election to a participation of grace in Time (*in viâ*), which is not to ripen in Eternity (*in Patriâ*). ‘Our heart is not in our power,’ said S. Ambrose. And so a late eminent thinker remarks; “The Unconscious—*das Unbewusste*—is found controlling each man’s destiny without, or in defiance of, his will.” (Pattison, *Memoirs*, p. 330.)

## CHAPTER XIX.

## OF ELECTION.

Description  
of the Elect.

§. 1. "IF the will of GOD be asserted to be so indifferent throughout all ages to the saving all mankind and calling them to the knowledge of the truth, that it be shown to have passed by no man in any quarter, the impenetrable depth of GOD's judgments is assailed. For why 'in times past He suffered all nations to walk in their own ways,'<sup>a</sup> when 'GOD chose Jacob unto Himself,'<sup>b</sup> and 'dealt not so with any nation, nor manifested His judgments unto them;'<sup>c</sup> and why they 'which in time past were not a people are now the people of GOD,' and they 'which had not obtained mercy now have obtained mercy;'<sup>d</sup> and 'where it was said unto them, Ye are not My people; there shall they be called the children of the living GOD:'<sup>e</sup> and why 'Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded:'<sup>f</sup> it is impossible to comprehend, and a matter of perilous curiosity to inquire. While notwithstanding, no one is allowed to be ignorant, that 'there is no iniquity with GOD;'<sup>g</sup> and that no man, either before the Law or under the Law, was justified by any other grace or other faith than by this same one, whereby our LORD JESUS CHRIST according to the counsel of His will came in the end of the ages to seek and to save that which had perished."<sup>h</sup> "Who-soever then have been distinguished by this bounty of Divine grace from the original condemnation of Adam, there is no doubt but that the hearing of the Gospel is procured for them;

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiv. 16.

<sup>b</sup> Ps. cxxxv. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Ps. cxlvii. 20.

<sup>d</sup> 1 S. Pet. ii. 10.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. ix. 26.

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid.* xi. 7.

<sup>g</sup> 2 Chron. xix. 7.

<sup>h</sup> *Prosperi Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum, ad calcem S. Aug. Tom. X. App. p. 201.*

and when they hear, they believe, and persevere unto the end in the faith that worketh by love; and, if at any time they go out of the path, being rebuked they are amended; and some of them, even though they be not rebuked of men, return to the way which they had forsaken; and some, having received grace, at whatever period of life, are withdrawn by a speedy death from the perils of this life. For all these things worketh He in them, Who hath wrought them (as) vessels of mercy. Who hath also chosen them in His SON before the foundation of the world by the election of grace: 'and if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.'<sup>1</sup> For they are not so called as not to be elect: wherefore it is said, 'for many be called but few chosen.'<sup>2</sup> But since they have been called according to His purpose, doubtless they have been also chosen by the election of grace, not of their own precedent merits; because to them grace is all their merit."<sup>k</sup> Thorndike in his zeal against Calvinism saith, "This word 'elect' hath no manner of reference to GOD's everlasting decree, but to the *present Christianity* of those whom He declareth His 'first-fruits' out of all the rest of the creatures." (*Of the Cov. of Gr. c. XXXI. §. 25.*) If so, then Demas and Luke were equally 'elect' in His sight, when Paul wrote to the Colossians, (c. iv. 14.) and to Philemon (v. 24.) But, if words have any meaning, GOD foreknew from all eternity the steadfastness of S. Luke and Demas's apostasy, with its motive, 'love of this present world.' (2 *Tim.* iv. 10.) Then, if the elect be but 'first-fruits,' are 'all the rest of the creatures' 'fruits' in any sense, or 'tares'? Nay, the prevision of man's obedience is not the cause of GOD's election; the secret is above and beyond our understanding, yet proceeds from GOD's dealings with the universe and His choice of the best plan. (Leibniz, *Ep. ad Des Bosses*, 10.) We may adopt Plato's words, and say that, like Virtue, Election comes not from race or training simply, but *from a divine destiny*. (See above, p. 75.)

"They have been chosen then before the foundation of the world by that predestination, whereby GOD hath foreknown

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xi. 6.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. xx. 16.

<sup>k</sup> S. Aug. De Correptione et Gratia, c. 7. §. 13. Tom. X. p. 757.

what He would do ; but they have been chosen out of the world by that calling, whereby GOD fulfilleth that which He hath predestinated. ‘For whom He hath predestinated, them hath He also called,’<sup>1</sup> to wit, with the calling that is according to His purpose. None other then but whom He hath predestinated, the same hath He also called ; nor other but whom He hath so called, the same hath He also justified ; nor other but whom He hath predestinated, called, justified, the same hath He also glorified, in that end, to be sure, which hath no end.”<sup>m</sup> “This then is the assumption of all mankind, this the adoption of the sons of GOD, this the fulness of the Gentiles, foreknown and predestinated in CHRIST before the foundation of the world. This is Jerusalem, which from beginning to end is being built of lively and elect stones, as a city founded on JESUS CHRIST Himself the Corner-Stone, ‘in Whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the LORD.’”<sup>n</sup> Of these stones none is cast out, none is diminished, none is snatched away. For the Truth saith, ‘All that the FATHER giveth Me shall come to Me ; and him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out.’<sup>o</sup> And again : ‘But ye believe not, because ye are not of My sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear My voice and I know them, and they follow Me : and I give unto them eternal life ; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of My hand.’”<sup>p</sup>

Of the Per-  
severance of  
the Elect.

§. 2. “Whosoever then in the most provident disposition of GOD have been foreknown, predestinated, called, justified, glorified, I do not say even while they are not yet born again, but even while they be not yet born, are already the sons of GOD, and cannot at all perish. These truly come to CHRIST ; because they so come, as He Himself saith, ‘All that the FATHER giveth Me shall come to Me ; and Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out.’”<sup>q</sup> And a little after ; ‘And this is the FATHER’S will which hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me I should lose nothing.’”<sup>r</sup> By

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii. 30.

<sup>m</sup> De Prædest. Sanctorum, c. 17.

§. 34. p. 813.

<sup>n</sup> Eph. ii. 21.

<sup>o</sup> S. John vi. 37.

<sup>p</sup> *Ib.* x. 26—28.—Prosper, *ubi*

*supra.*

<sup>q</sup> S. John vi. 37.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* v. 39.

Him then is also given perseverance in good even unto the end; for it is not given moreover but to them who shall not perish, since they who persevere not shall perish.”<sup>a</sup> “None of them perisheth; because all which the FATHER hath given to the SON, He will lose nothing thereof. Whosoever then is thereof perisheth not at all; nor was he that perisheth thereof. Wherefore it is said, ‘They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.’”<sup>b</sup>

“To the first man, who being made upright had received the power or capability of not sinning, not dying, not deserting good itself, the aid of perseverance was given; not whereby it might come to pass that he should persevere, but one without which he could not persevere by free will. But now to the Saints predestinated by GOD’s grace into the kingdom of GOD such aid of perseverance is not given, but perseverance itself is granted them; not only that without that gift they cannot persevere, but also that by that gift they do not otherwise than persevere. For not only hath He said, ‘Without Me ye can do nothing;’<sup>c</sup> but He hath also said, ‘Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain.’<sup>d</sup> By which words He hath shown that He hath not only given them righteousness, but also perseverance therein. For when CHRIST thus ordained them, that they should go and bring forth fruit, and that their fruit should remain; who may venture to say, It will not remain? Who will dare to say, Perhaps it will not remain? ‘For the gifts and calling of GOD are without repentance;’<sup>e</sup> but it is the calling of them who are called according to His purpose. When CHRIST then prays for them that their faith fail not, doubtless it will not fail even unto the end; and hereby it will persevere unto the end, and the end of this life will not find it otherwise than remaining.”<sup>f</sup> Thus, S. Peter Thomas, A.D. 1366, died

<sup>a</sup> S. Aug. De Correptione et Gratia, c. 9. §. 23. p. 763.

<sup>b</sup> 1 S. John ii. 19.—De Prædest. Sanctorum, c. 16. §. 33. p. 812.

<sup>c</sup> S. John xv. 5.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* v. 16.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. xi. 29.

<sup>f</sup> De Correptione et Gratia, c. 12, §. 34, p. 769.

declaring his confidence in his election in CHRIST. (*Sanctorale Catholic.* p. 62.) Blessed Bernard of Tiron, A.D. 1114, had a vision, that “*the book of unchangeable Predestination retained his name written therein.*” (*Ibid.* p. 188.) Bishop Bull traces the origin of the notion of Perseverance to the Valentinian heretics! In his attack on S. Augustine he might as well at once have said that it was a relic of Manichæism that stuck to him. Yet the Gospel of S. John hath that which cannot thus be explained away.

Of the number of the Elect.

§. 3. “Of these who have been predestinated into the kingdom of GOD, the number is so certain, that no one is either added to them or diminished from them. Although John the Baptist signifies this, where he saith, ‘Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that GOD is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham;’<sup>7</sup> to show that they, if they brought forth no fruit, would be so cut down, that the number which was promised to Abraham should not be wanting; yet it is said more openly in the Revelation, ‘Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.’<sup>8</sup> For if another is not to take it unless that person hath lost it, the number is certain.”<sup>a</sup> “Of this number some live spiritually, and enter on the more excellent way of charity; and, when they instruct in the spirit of meekness a man taken in any offence, they watch lest themselves also be tempted. And, when perchance they themselves also are taken, the affection of love is somewhat repressed in them, but not extinguished; and again rising and blazing afresh is restored to its former course. For they know how to say, ‘My soul hath slept for heaviness; strengthen Thou me in Thy words.’<sup>b</sup> But when in anything they be otherwise minded, that also shall GOD reveal unto them, continuing in the ardour of charity nor breaking the bond of peace. Others, being still carnal, at present exercise their souls’ growth, and are nourished with the milk of holy mysteries, that they may become fit for the meat of the spiritual; those things, which in evil manners

<sup>7</sup> S. Matt. iii. 8, 9.

<sup>a</sup> Rev. iii. 11.

<sup>8</sup> S. Aug. *ubi supra*, c. 13. §. 39.  
p. 772.      <sup>b</sup> Ps. cxix. 28.

are manifest even to popular judgment, they avoid in the fear of GOD; and most vigilantly do their best so as to be less and less delighted with earthly and temporal things; they hold most firmly the rule of faith most diligently sought for; and, if they deviate aught therefrom, they are speedily corrected by Catholic authority; however in its words, according to the carnal sense, they may still waver in the various concourse of fancies. Some there be also of that number, who still live wickedly, or even lie in heresies or in the superstitions of the Gentiles: and yet even there the LORD knoweth them that are His. For in that ineffable foreknowledge of GOD many who seem to be without are within, and many who seem within are without. Of all these then, who (so to say) are within intrinsically and in secret, consists that garden inclosed, that fountain sealed, that well of living water, that orchard with pleasant fruits.<sup>c</sup> The gifts of these Divinely bestowed are partly proper, as, indefatigable love in this present time and eternal life in the world to come; but partly in common with the evil and perverse, as all other gifts; among which also are the holy Mysteries."<sup>d</sup> It skills not to speculate on the question whether the Elect or the Reprobate include the majority of mankind. The LORD of all declares plainly of the *narrow* way to eternal life, "Few there be that find it." Eminent Christians are divided on the subject. While Augustine and S. Bridget, (who in her *Fifteen Prayers* speaks of "*reprobatorum in multitudine damnandorum*"—words omitted by Horst and Pusey, but extant in certain editions prior to A.D. 1550,) incline to the dark side, Jerome, Prudentius and others embrace the hopeful. Only our hope of being elect hinges on our conviction of the present grace of GOD mortifying sin within us and shedding peace. Practical Christians (as they are called, who shut their eyes to the supernatural, and make the Gospel a mere competing scheme

\* Canticles iv. 12, 13.

<sup>d</sup> S. Aug. De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. v. c. 27. §. 38. Tom. IX. p. 159.—The same doctrine is also taught in the Liturgies: as in the Canon of the Roman Mass, in the prayer 'Super Oblata,' "Ab aeterna damnatione nos eripi,

et in electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari:" and in the English Baptismal Office; "That he may ever remain in the number of Thy faithful and elect children;" and in the Te Deum, "Make them to be numbered with Thy saints in glory everlasting."



of philanthropy,) in vain elude the question. For all their prudence, it *will* challenge attention. Even if all Christians were truly elect to eternal life, some would naturally complain that the Christian theory was "narrow and inadequate, because it made GOD care only for a mere handful of the human species." (Pattison, *Memoirs*, p. 327.) May I hope that some, whose faith is anchored on GOD'S Word, may derive comfort from the considerations hereafter offered?

Of the  
titular Elect  
and the Re-  
probate.

§. 4. Having now described the Elect, their perseverance, and number, in the words of S. Augustine, I would notice that we cannot in this life anticipate the award of GOD's final judgment and so separate mankind clean off into two great classes of Elect and Reprobate; but, as many Christians doubtless have been tempted to consign to the latter division some, who may even yet be saved as "a brand plucked out of the fire;"<sup>e</sup> so many also are found in CHRIST'S visible fold, whom He will disown at His second coming; but who, notwithstanding, by virtue of their outward profession of the One Faith and participation in the One Baptism are *titularly* Elect and Regenerate. Nor can we say that this is the Church's language of *hope* and *charity* merely. For it applies to those who are really and in the sight of GOD Elect, as well as to those who are supposed by the Church to be Elect but who are in GOD'S sight Reprobate. What know we of our Election or of our new Birth in CHRIST, save through faith, which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen?"<sup>f</sup> It is the presumption of faith, which applies to all the baptized those prerogatives whereof Baptism is the seal and earnest, albeit we know all the while that all will not receive the crown. Of these titular Elect we may say, "They who are not to persevere but are to fall so from Christian faith and conversation, that the end of this life may find them such; doubtless, not even at the time when they live well and piously, are they to be reckoned in the number of the Elect. For they have not been distinguished by the foreknowledge and predestination of GOD from the mass of perdition; and therefore neither have they been called according to His purpose, and hereby not even Elect: but they

<sup>e</sup> Zech. iii. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Heb. xi. 1.

have been called among those, of whom it is said, 'Many be called;' not among them, of whom it is said, 'But few chosen.'<sup>s</sup> And yet who may deny them to be Elect, when they believe, and are baptized, and live according to God? Plainly they are called Elect by those that know not what they will be, not by Him, Who knows that they have not the perseverance which leads the Elect to happiness, and Who knows that they so stand as that He foreknows that they will fall."<sup>h</sup>

"These, when they live piously, are called Sons of God: but, inasmuch as they will live impiously and die in the same impiety, the foreknowledge of God calls them not Sons of God. For there are Sons of God, who are not yet so to us, and are already so to GOD; of whom John the Evangelist saith, 'that JESUS should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of GOD that were scattered abroad:'"<sup>i</sup> because indeed by believing they were to be such through the preaching of the Gospel; and yet before that came to pass, they were already the children of GOD, written with unshaken stability in their FATHER'S memorial. And there are again some, who are by us called children of GOD on account of grace received even temporarily, and yet they are not so to GOD: of whom the same John saith; 'They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.'"<sup>j</sup> Thorndike seems to assume that the doctrine of S. Augustine was against 'the tradition of the whole Church.' (Book II. c. xxvi. § 32.) But I urge 1. that it is in vain to insist on loose statements made before the whole question was raised, as Pelagius did raise it; just as dubious utterances touching the Trinity before the Nicene council must not weigh against the settled faith of the Church. 2. That the Eastern Church not being disturbed by Pelagius, its judgment was never formally recorded for or against Augustine. 3. Far from Augustine's tenets breeding distrust of him, he was honoured with a special

<sup>s</sup> S. Matt. xx. 16.

<sup>h</sup> S. Au. De Correptione et Gratia, c. 7, §. 16, p. 758.

<sup>i</sup> S. John xi. 51, 52.

<sup>j</sup> 1 S. John ii. 19. S. Aug. *Ibid.* c. 9, §. 20, p. 760.

summons to attend the general council of Ephesus, which his rank as a mere African bishop did not entitle him to. 4. That the West with the See Apostolic of Rome did pronounce in his favour. 5. That Thorndike goes against tradition, when he presses Scriptures clearly directed against apostasy, as Heb. vi. 4-8. x. 26-29, as if they bore against all mortal sin after baptism. And 6. that, when urged by the language of S. John and S. Paul, he concludes they, "being assured of their own adoption, *presumed* the like of others," (c. xxxi. §. 10) that is, dealt in compliments! "They were then in good, but because they continued not in it, that is, persevered not in it unto the end, 'they were not,' he saith, 'of us,' even when they were with us; that is, they were not of the number of God's children, even when they were in the children's faith: since they who are truly His children are foreknown and predestinated to be conformed to the likeness of His Son, and have been called according to His purpose that they might be chosen. For the son of promise perisheth not, but the son of perdition." \* "We call them then Elect and Disciples of CHRIST and Children of God, because they are to be so called, whom being regenerated we behold living piously. But then are they truly what they are called, if they shall have continued in that on account of which they are so called. But if they have not perseverance, that is, continue not in that which they have begun to be, they are *not truly called that which they are called and are not*: for this they are not in His presence, to Whom is known what they will be, that is, from (being) good evil."<sup>1</sup> When

\* S. John xvii. 12. S. Aug. *Ibid.* p. 761.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* c. 9, §. 22, p. 762.—A question occurs in connection with this section, which is answered with a profusion of Mediæval fancy by Honorius of Autun. "Sed cum Deus hac ita ab initio disposuerit, et omnia ita non evenire inevitabile sit, ad quid ultimum judicium restabit? Sicut pictor, cum singulos colores posuerit, unumquemque in suo loco, prout visum fuerit, ad ultimum nigro colore cuncta discriminat, ut totius picturæ or-

natus melius clarescat; ita Deus, dum omnem varietatem sui operis prout vult disposuerit, ad extremum reprobos ab electis, ut nigrum a pretioso colore, segregat; ut de nigredine illorum supplicii splendidior fiat claritudo istorum gaudii. Denique Patriarchæ et Prophete pro viridi colore, Apostoli pro aëreo, Martyres pro rubeo, Confessores pro croceo, Monachi pro purpureo, Virgines pro albo, continentes pro griseo, uxorati pro ferrugineo, peccatores pro nigro, in pictura Dei accipiuntur; quæ omnia ordo An-

our hearts fail us for fear in contemplating the number of the lost, it may be well to remember that we are ignorant of the relations of our race with other portions of GOD's universe; that taking into account the infinite orders of spirits and reasonable animals which possibly inhabit the fixed stars (every one of which is a sun to its own satellites), we may justly hope that the sum of felicity far exceeds that of misery; and that the conclusion of the tale which is now being unfolded to 'principalities and powers in heavenly places' will be such as to provoke their jubilation. (See Leibniz, *Théodicée, versus finem*.—*Causa Dei Asserta*, §§. 57-59).

§. 5. "No man is to be said with certainty to belong to the calling of GOD which is without repentance, unless when he hath departed out of this world; but in this life, which is a trial upon earth,<sup>m</sup> 'let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.'<sup>n</sup> "For which of the Faithful, as long as we live in this mortal life, may presume that he is in the number of the Predestinated? Since this must needs be hidden here, where elation is to be so avoided, that so great an Apostle (as Paul) was even buffeted by an angel of Satan, lest he should be exalted above measure."<sup>o</sup> "And yet this Predestination, which is explained openly enough, even in the words of the Gospel, hindered not the LORD from saying on account of beginning, 'Ye believe in GOD, believe also in Me;' <sup>p</sup> and on account of persevering, 'that men ought always to pray and not to faint.'<sup>q</sup> For they to whom it is granted, hear this and do it: but they, to whom it is not given, do it not, whether they hear or whether they do not hear. For 'it is given unto you,' He saith, 'to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.'<sup>r</sup> Whereof the one belongs to the mercy, the other to the judgment of Him, to Whom our soul saith, 'I will sing of mercy and judgment: unto Thee, O LORD, will I

Cautions  
about apply-  
ing the doc-  
trine of  
Election.

gelicus cingit, ut varius auricolor limbus. Hæc universa illa summa pulchritudo ornat et illustrat, quæ singulis suum proprium colorem præstat." Honorii Augustodunensis *De Prædestinatione et Libero Arbitrio Dialogus, circ. finem; ap. Georgii Cassandri Opera*, p. 636.

<sup>m</sup> Job vii. 1.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. x. 12.—*De Dono Perseverantiæ*, c. 13, §. 33, p. 838.

<sup>o</sup> *De Correctione et Gratia*, c. 13, §. 40, p. 772.

<sup>p</sup> S. John xiv. 1.

<sup>q</sup> S. Luke xviii. 1.

<sup>r</sup> S. Matth. xiii. 11.

sing.”\* “As to reasons for being silent about it, it would be long to search for them all; of which however this is one, lest we should make those who do not understand worse, while we desire to make those who do understand more instructed; who (were we to be silent about such a subject,) would be less informed indeed, but not become worse. But when the real state of the case is this, that when we say it he who cannot take it becomes worse, yet when we are silent he who can take it becomes so, what are we to do? Ought not the truth rather to be told, that he who can may take it than be passed over in silence, so that not only both persons may not take it, but also he that is intelligent be himself the worse? who if he were to hear and receive the doctrine, more also would learn by his means. For the more capable he is of learning, the more fit he is to teach others. The enemy of grace is urgent by all means, that it be believed to be given according to our merits, and so grace be no longer grace; and are we unwilling to say that which we can say with the witness of Scripture? For we fear, you see, lest, when we speak, he who cannot receive the truth be offended; and are we not afraid, lest, when we are silent, he who can receive the truth be taken by falsehood?”† “When these and such like things are said either to a few Christians or to the multitude of the Church, why do we fear to preach, as Holy Scripture preaches it, the Predestination of the Saints and very Grace of God, that is, which is not given according to our merits? Is it in truth to be feared, lest Man should then despair of himself, when his hope is shown to be placed in God; but should not despair, if proud and unhappy he place it in himself?”‡ “To us then who know not who is or is not the son of peace, it pertains to make no exception and to distinguish no one, but to wish all to be saved, to whom we preach this peace. For neither is it to be feared lest we lose it, if he to whom we preach is not the son of peace, we being ignorant thereof; for it will return to us, that is, that preaching will profit us, not him; but if the peace we preach

\* Ps. ci. 1.—De Dono Perseverantiae, c. 14, §. 35, p. 840.

† *Ibid.* c. 16, §. 40, p. 843.

‡ *Ibid.* c. 22, §. 62, p. 855.

rests on him, it will profit both us and him.”\* “At least let him who hath not received reject it: provided however, he who receives it take and drink, drink and live. For as piety is to be preached, that GOD may be rightly worshipped by him who hath ears to hear; as charity is to be preached, that GOD and our neighbour may be loved by him who hath ears to hear; so also is this Predestination of GOD’s benefits to be preached, that he who hath ears to hear may glory, not in himself, but in the LORD.”† If, as Augustine saith, “we know not who is or is not the son of peace,” we may be allowed to incline to the prevailing sentiment within the Church of Rome, which in regard to persons outside her Communion, and even heathens rightly employing their natural lights, measures them not by the rule of explicit Faith; but trusts that the love of GOD on their part may have had the effect of effacing sin even without sacramental means, provided there be no wilful or conscious disregard of the same. Such was the mind of S. Francis Xavier and of S. Francis De Sales. (Leibniz, *Théodicée* Pt. I. §§. 95, 6.) Leibniz, whose conspicuous merit and clear reasoning puts him in the first rank of thinkers, dwells on the probability of GOD’s imparting an extraordinary light in their last agony to those who, to the last not Christians, have yet according to their opportunities “feared Him and worked righteousness.” (*Acts* x. 35.)

But where no proof can be supplied by Revelation or experience, I prefer citing as a probable indication the mysterious transaction hinted at by S. Peter, where he saith that CHRIST “preached unto the spirits in prison,” whose disobedience had been in the days of Noe; (1 *Peter* iii. 19.) and the practice, referred to by S. Paul, of baptizing for the dead. For I am convinced, 1. that the mysterious interpretation of those passages is the true one; and 2. that the analogy of the gradual discipline of the Elect in this life applies to the case we are supposing; and that such analogy is better met by a purgatorian theory of a reconciliation after death than by one that fixes the transaction at a fleeting instant of time and in the extremity of dissolution.

\* De Corrupt. et Gratia, c. 15, §. 46, p. 776.

† De Dono Perseverant. c. 20, §. 61, p. 950.

## CHAPTER XX.

## OF JUSTIFICATION, AND OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

The Description  
of Justification.

§. 1. HAVING treated of Predestination as the preparation and designment of GOD's benefits to His Elect, and of Election as the act whereby GOD discriminates certain of His creatures to be the recipients of those bounties, we come now to that act, whereby He applies *in time* to His Elect the remission of sins and earnest of glory purchased for them by CHRIST JESUS. That act is termed *Justification*. "No one can be justified except by union with CHRIST, Who is the cause of our justification."<sup>x</sup> "Every gift of good works is a Divine preparation, nor is any one justified by his own virtue, since grace is to every man the beginning of righteousness, and the fountain of merit."<sup>y</sup> "I think," writes Cardinal Contarini, "that it is Christianly said, that we should rest, as on a sure support, on the righteousness of CHRIST bestowed on us, not on grace inherent in us. For this our righteousness is inchoate and imperfect, which cannot save us from offending in many things and sinning continually, and therefore need we daily ask that our debts be forgiven us. Therefore in the sight of GOD we cannot because of this our righteousness be accounted righteous, as it becomes the sons of GOD to be good and holy: but the righteousness of CHRIST hath been bestowed on us, a true and perfect righteousness, which is entirely pleasing in the sight of GOD, wherein is nothing that may offend Him. On this alone sure and steadfast righteousness therefore are we to rest, and because of it alone to believe that we are justified before GOD, that is, ac-

<sup>x</sup> Durand. in Lib. 4. Sent. Dist. 1, qu. 8, §. 6;

<sup>y</sup> S. Leo P. P. Epist. 86, ap. Labbe. Tom. I.I. p. 1388.

counted and called righteous. This is that precious treasure of Christians, which whosoever findeth leaveth all that he hath to buy it. This is the precious pearl, which whosoever findeth leaveth all that he hath to possess it. 'Yea, doubtless,' saith the Apostle Paul, 'and I count all things but loss—that I may win CHRIST, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of CHRIST, the righteousness which is of God by faith.'"<sup>\*</sup> Although we may not put aside the fact of the Covenant of Grace, which Baptism tenders us, and which supposes reciprocal obligations on our part, it remains that, seeing Christians are now baptized as infants, and the effectual discipline of public penance is in abeyance, the hope inspired by CHRIST'S satisfaction is that sure ground, the touch whereof quickens us, and by animating us to overcome sin justifies us. Our choice or free will goes forth to meet God's grace; but it is the motive supplied by grace, even CHRIST'S righteousness, that justifies.

When we come to inquire, What is that grace which is given to us in GOD'S act of justification, to meet His imputation of CHRIST'S merits? we shall find that it is Faith. For as, in order to determine the complexion and character of any action, we search for the motive which must have previously dwelt in the mind of the agent, and characterise the action accordingly; so our faith in CHRIST and assent to His claims on our obedience necessarily precede even our love to Him. Therefore, whether we regard Faith subjectively, as the motive which lies at the bottom of all Christian action, or objectively, as embracing the facts to which we assent in this particular; the whole work of the Christian Religion is most conveniently as well as compendiously comprised under the article of Justification by Faith. "For true Faith, that justifies the ungodly and makes them righteous, being drawn to the Partner of its humanity, acquires salvation in Him, in Whom alone Man finds himself innocent; having freedom through the grace of GOD to boast of His power, Who in the humility of our flesh having combated against

<sup>\*</sup> Gasparis Contareni S. R. E. inter Opp. p. 592; Ed. Paris; Cardinalis Tract. De Justificatione, 1571.



the proud enemy gives His victory to those in whose body He has triumphed." \* "By living and true Faith, whereby we believe that all our sins and all penalties due to them are pardoned to us trusting in CHRIST, we are admitted to participate in the merits of CHRIST, to purification through His Blood, to plenteous redemption and remission of sins, as far as relates to all penalty and guilt; lastly, to peace and reconciliation with GOD. Good works, as far as they are *works*, that is, as far as they look to the commandment '*Do this,*' justify not, but only so far as they are acts of justifying Faith, elicited or enjoined by it. For the Saints work righteousness through faith. And good works are from GOD; and all our merits are of the mercy of the LORD. We merit, not from that which is due to works, but from the mercy granted through faith." b

Justification, why by Faith only.

§. 2. Justification then is the act of GOD in applying His saving grace to the souls of His Elect, whether in the Sacrament of Baptism or afterwards by other means. It is said to be by faith, because Faith is a Divine gift, which inclines the heart to accept the mercies of GOD in CHRIST, and ever forms the mainspring and motive of all genuine good works necessary unto salvation. Whether this saving Faith be a distinct spiritual faculty, infused by the HOLY GHOST into the heirs of salvation, and perfectly a new creation, different in kind from that assent which often passes under the name of Faith (that is, the Tridentine view); or whether it be the same intellectual faculty, only *transsubstantiated* (so to say), transformed, and spiritualised by the indwelling of the HOLY GHOST; it is impossible to say. But we must never forget its objective side, namely, the engagement of the Christian not only to accept the promises of GOD in CHRIST, but also the terms on the performance whereof those promises are tendered, that is, the keeping of the New Law.

Damascene speaks of Faith as twofold, but does not say which division is saving Faith. "Faith," he says, "is two-

\* S. Leo, Epist. 83; Tom. III. p. 1379.

b Joannis Barnesii Benedictini

Angli Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, §. 5, ap. Brown. Fascicul. Rerum, Tom. II. p. 844.

fold. For 'Faith cometh by hearing;' <sup>c</sup> for, hearing the Divine Scriptures, we believe the teaching of the HOLY GHOST. But it is perfected by all that CHRIST hath ordained, believing in deed, reverencing, and doing the commandments of Him that hath renewed us. \* \* Faith again is, 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen;' <sup>d</sup> or an unwavering and inseparable hope of what GOD hath promised to us and of our obtaining what we ask for. The first then is of our mind (*τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης*); the second, of the gifts of the SPIRIT." <sup>e</sup> But here there appears to be a fallacy. For, whereas the sweet persuasion of our being accepted in CHRIST undoubtedly attends saving Faith, and is rightly stated to be 'of the gifts of the SPIRIT,' the Faith 'whereby we believe the teaching of the HOLY GHOST' is said to be 'of our mind.' What is this but the Semi-Pelagian error of attributing the principle of our salvation to something which after all is ours, not "to JESUS the *Author*" as well as "Finisher of our faith" ? <sup>f</sup>

With a more spiritual discernment Augustine ingenuously confesses, that when he had before his Episcopate "similarly erred, thinking that the Faith whereby we believe in GOD was not GOD's gift, but that it is in us from ourselves, and that by it we obtain the gifts of GOD whereby we live temperately, justly, and piously in this world;" he was convinced chiefly by that testimony of the Apostle, saying, 'What hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?' <sup>g</sup> "For incipient Faith is also His gift, lest the Apostle's thanksgiving be deservedly judged false or fallacious. What is it but the incipient faith of the Thessalonians, concerning which he thanks GOD, saying; 'For this cause also thank we GOD without ceasing, because, when ye received the Word of GOD which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the Word of

<sup>a</sup> Rom. x. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Heb. xi. 1.

<sup>e</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. De Orthod. Fide, c. 87.

<sup>f</sup> Heb. xii. 2.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 7.—S. Aug. De Prædestinatione Sanctorum, c. 8, §. 7, p. 793.

GOD, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." <sup>b</sup>  
 "Thus then the Apostle distinguishes faith from works; even as in the two kingdoms of the Hebrews Judah is distinguished from Israel, whereas Judah itself is (a part of) Israel. But he therefore saith, that a man is justified by faith, not by works; because (faith) itself is given first; by which are obtained what are properly called *works*, wherein men live righteously. For he himself saith also, 'For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.'<sup>1</sup> That is; And that which I said 'through faith' is not of yourselves; but Faith also is the gift of God."<sup>j</sup>

The same doctrine is authoritatively declared by the Council of Orange, A.D. 529. "This also we soundly profess and believe, that in every good work we do not begin and are afterwards assisted by God's mercy; but He Himself, no good deserts of ours preceding, first inspires into us both faith and the love of Himself, that we may both faithfully seek for the Sacrament of Baptism, and after Baptism may with His aid fulfil those things that are pleasing to Him. Whence most clearly it is to be believed, that that admirable Faith of the thief whom the LORD recalled to His home of Paradise, and of Cornelius the centurion to whom the angel of the LORD was sent, and of Zacchæus who merited to receive the LORD Himself, was *not of nature*, but was the gift of Divine bounty."<sup>k</sup> And Pope Boniface II. in his reply to Cæsarius of Arles, confirming the said Council, says; "It is certain and Catholic, that in all good things, whereof Faith is the chief, the Divine mercy prevents us, being yet unwilling, so that we may will; is present with us, when we will; follows us also, that we may continue to the end; as the prophet David saith; 'The God of my mercy shall prevent me;'<sup>1</sup> and again, 'My mercy shall be with him;'<sup>m</sup> and elsewhere, 'Mercy shall follow me.'<sup>n</sup> In like manner also S. Paul saith: 'Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall

<sup>b</sup> 1 Thess. ii. 13. S. Aug. *Ibid.* ap. Labbe. T. IV. p. 1672.

c. 19. §. 39, p. 816.

<sup>1</sup> Eph. ii. 8.

<sup>j</sup> S. Aug. *Ibid.* c. 7, §. 12, p. 798.

<sup>k</sup> Conc. Arausiaci ii. Canon 25,

<sup>1</sup> Ps. lix. 10.

<sup>m</sup> Ps. lxxxix. 24.

<sup>n</sup> Ps. xxiii. 6.

be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things.'<sup>o</sup> Whence we are greatly surprised, that they who think contrariwise should be to that extent weighed down by the remains of ancient error, as to believe that men come to CHRIST, not by GOD's benefit, but by that of nature; and say, that the good of nature itself which we know to have been depraved by Adam's sin, is the author of our faith rather than CHRIST; nor understand, that they reclaim against the LORD's sentence, saying "No man can come unto Me, except it were given him of My FATHER." <sup>p</sup>

§. 3. Here then it may be asked, Whether *confidence* or 'full assurance' of future salvation enters into the definition of the Faith which justifies? When we consider Justification in its fulness of meaning, I think it cannot be denied that a loving, trusting confidence of the stability of GOD's work within their hearts in time and to eternity must accompany the faith of the Elect, that faith alone which fully justifies. The following passages of Scripture seem to teach this clearly. "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, FATHER. The SPIRIT itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of GOD: and if children, then heirs; heirs of GOD, and joint-heirs with CHRIST."<sup>q</sup> "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for He is faithful that promised.)"<sup>r</sup> "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards GOD."<sup>s</sup>

Of Assurance of final salvation, whether necessary to Justifying Faith.

Without this *fiducia* or loving assurance Faith is robbed of its sunshine, and reduced to be a mere assent to certain theological propositions. Such a Faith justifies not. Rather, without love, "in deed and in truth" toward GOD and the brethren, it is not Faith, but *mere assent*. For it is by this

<sup>o</sup> Rom. xi. 35, 36.

<sup>p</sup> S. John vi. 65.—Bonifacii P.P. ii. Epist. ii. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1688.

<sup>q</sup> Rom. viii. 15—17.

<sup>r</sup> Heb. x. 22, 23.

<sup>s</sup> 1 S. John iii. 21.

sweet confidence, that "we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before Him."<sup>†</sup> But the same difficulty meets us here as in applying the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, namely, the incongruity of supposing that to exist in all members of the visible Church which we know can only exist in the Elect. To deny that the Reprobate are in any sense justified and regenerate, would be to deny the efficacy of the 'one Baptism for the remission of sins.' For S. Peter distinctly teaches us, that the Reprobate do for a while receive grace, are justified, regenerate, sanctified, when he says; "For if, *after they have escaped the pollutions of the world* through the knowledge of the LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, *after they have known it*, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them."<sup>‡</sup> But it is only *for a period*, for they receive not the grace of final perseverance; whereas the Elect, being "born of GOD," not only in Baptism, but "according to His purpose," "doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him."<sup>§</sup>

The inconvenience, then, of embracing this *fiducia* or assurance in the definition of Justifying Faith arises from our being thereby driven to include the experience of spiritual and saintly men, whose life is truly "hid with CHRIST in God,"<sup>¶</sup> in that of those who are but "carnal" and "babes in CHRIST;"<sup>‡</sup> nay, even in the profession of outward formalists. "The Church, to be sure," says S. Bernard, "hath her spiritual men, who may not only faithfully but also with confidence act herein, conversing with GOD as with a friend, the consciousness of His glory bearing them witness. Who they be, that indeed is in GOD's power; but hearken thou what sort of a person thou shouldest be, if thou wouldest be such an one. I would say this however, not as if I had experienced, but as wishing to experience."<sup>§</sup> Very different

<sup>†</sup> *Ibid.* v. 19.

<sup>‡</sup> 2 S. Pet. ii. 20, 21.

<sup>§</sup> 1 S. John iii. 9.

<sup>¶</sup> Col. iii. 3.

<sup>\*</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 1.

<sup>†</sup> S. Bernard. *super Cantica*  
Serm. 69.

from the Assurance of the Saints is the notion that Justifying Faith is the persuasion of a believer that he is saved, yet for the merits of CHRIST. Such a persuasion may be born of a sanguine temperament, or of carnal presumption. It carries with it no proof of its premising repentance as a condition; nor doth it necessarily suppose the work of sanctification. And it is open to the scornful objection of Socinus, that Justification is a benefit granted to a man, because he believes it to have been already granted him.

Would we learn the nature of that crowning perfection of Christian Faith, let us listen to S. Bernard. "Who is the righteous man but he who repays the turn of love to GOD Who loveth him? Which is not done save by the SPIRIT's revealing to a man through faith the eternal purpose of GOD on his future salvation. And this revelation certainly is nought else than the infusion of spiritual grace; whereby, while the deeds of the flesh are being mortified, a man is prepared for the kingdom, which flesh and blood possess not, receiving at the same time in the One SPIRIT both whence he may presume himself beloved, and whence he may love in return, that he be not loved gratuitously. This then is that sacred and secret counsel, which the SON receiving from the FATHER in the HOLY GHOST communicates to those whom He knows through the same SPIRIT by justifying them, and by communicating justifies; since each person in his justification receives this, to wit, that he begins himself also to know, even as he is known; when it is granted him also to have a presentiment of his own future happiness. Of which knowledge of himself already gained in part, let him meanwhile indeed glory in hope, not yet however securely." So also S. Macarius: "Being admitted to the intimacy of the King of Heaven, having confidence with regard to the ALMIGHTY, the saints, even while they are yet in this world, are secure, from the pledge which they have now received, as being already crowned and reigning. And, being about to reign with CHRIST, they do not think it strange in consequence of the aggrandisement and the freedom of the SPIRIT. Why? Inasmuch as, while they were yet in the flesh, they had that

\* S. Bern. Epist. 107, *circ. finem*.

taste of sweetness and that operation of power.”<sup>a</sup> Thorndike ingenuously confesses, that the doctrine of the XI<sup>th</sup> Article and of the Homily it refers to “is utterly unreconcilable with the Baptismal Office and the Catechism; and is the first misunderstanding, from whence the dangerous errors of Antinomianism and of its contrary heresy Solifidianism proceed.” The only corrective is (he conceives) “the plain faith of the Catholic Church.” (Book II. ch. xxx. §. 16.) But is it not evident that the resting simply on the fact of infant Baptism bred a spiritual lethargy, which the annals of the Middle Ages confirm; and that *in the cloister* the corrective was applied of “the godly consideration of our Election in CHRIST,” as here by S. Bernard? It was the casting pearls before swine that bred Antinomianism. Where the Homily of Salvation takes away all merit of our works, attributing justification to faith only, its design is “to give all the glory to our SAVIOUR CHRIST,” not to assert that GOD requires not *covenanted* obedience from baptized Christians.

But for the consolation of those ‘babes in CHRIST,’ who have not experienced the confidence inspired by the Spirit of adoption, the beloved Disciple refers us to the ‘godly consideration of Predestination and our election in CHRIST:’<sup>b</sup> “For if our heart condemn us, GOD is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.”<sup>c</sup> “Here at length we may define the Faith, by which the just doth live, to be a firm and constant assent or adherence unto the mercies and loving-kindness of the LORD, or, generally, to the spiritual food exhibited in His sacred Word, as much better than this life itself and all the contentments it is capable of, grounded upon a taste or relish of their sweetness, wrought in the soul or heart of man by the Spirit of CHRIST.”<sup>d</sup>

Of the connection of Justifying Faith with Baptism.

§. 4. If justification then be the act of GOD in applying the merits of His SON to the souls of His Elect, and that through His own gift of Faith; it is clear, that, in the case of a person baptized as an adult, the act of Justification synchronizes with Baptism, because he therein makes his first

<sup>a</sup> S. Macarius, Hom. xvii. p. 248.

<sup>b</sup> Article xvii.

<sup>c</sup> 1 S. John iii. 20.

<sup>d</sup> Jackson, Works, Tom. I. p. 667.

visible public profession of Faith in CHRIST, and undertakes the obligation of obedience to GOD's Law, and the promises of GOD are therein visibly signed and sealed to him in return. I do not say, that he is *then only* justified, but chiefly and primarily. For in the laver of Regeneration, that great sin of Adam, the guilt whereof passes on to all his posterity, is remitted to the baptized ; so that, "being by nature born in sin the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." Nor that alone ; but, if the adult believer seeks Baptism with the faith that justifies, the words of S. Paul apply to him ; "Now he which stablisheth us with you in CHRIST, and hath anointed us, is GOD ; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the SPIRIT in our hearts."\*

The connection of Baptism with the Faith that justifies is thus clearly taught by the Fathers. S. Justin Martyr says ; "CHRIST, being the First-born of all creation, became also again a beginning of another stock that has been regenerated by Him through water and *faith*."† And Tertullian : "That laver is *the sealing of faith*, (*"obsignatio est fidei,"*) which Faith begins with the faith of repentance and is commended thereby. We are not therefore washed, in order that we may cease to sin, but because we have ceased ; inasmuch as we have been already washed in heart. For this is the first baptism of the Hearer, perfect fear ; thenceforth as long as thou feelest the LORD, thy faith is sound, when thy conscience hath once embraced repentance."‡ And against some, who argued that Baptism was unnecessary to those whom Faith sufficed, for that Abraham pleased GOD by the Sacrament not of water but of faith, he urges ; "Granted that ages back before the LORD's passion and resurrection salvation was by bare faith ; but when the faith has been augmented by belief in His nativity, passion, and resurrection, the Sacrament has been amplified, Baptism sealed, Faith clothed, which before was naked, and cannot be now without its law. For a law of baptizing has been imposed, and a form prescribed. 'Go ye,' He saith, 'and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY

\* 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

Dialog. cum Tryphone Judæo,

p. 367.

† De Pœnitentia, c. 6, p. 125.



GHOST.'<sup>b</sup> The definition bestowed on this law, 'Except a man be born of water and of the SPIRIT, he cannot enter into the kingdom of GOD,'<sup>i</sup> has tied Faith to the necessity of Baptism."<sup>j</sup> S. Cyril of Jerusalem, alluding to the case of Cornelius, says; "Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of JESUS CHRIST, that, *the soul having been regenerated through Faith*, the body also might partake of grace through Water."<sup>k</sup> And S. Basil writes: "Faith and Baptism are two modes of salvation, akin to each other and inseparable. For Faith indeed is perfected by Baptism, and Baptism has its foundation laid by Faith, and either of them is fulfilled by the same words. For, as we believe in the FATHER, and the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, so also are we baptized in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. And the confession that leads to salvation precedes, but the Baptism that seals our assent follows."<sup>l</sup> There is another strong link between Baptism and Justifying Faith. If the faith which embraces all the articles of Christian belief shrinks from outward profession and will not come to terms with GOD by a covenant of obedience to Him, which Baptism pledges the believer to, it is convicted of insincerity. Therefore CHRIST declares Faith and Baptism to be the credentials of a man's salvation; but the absence of Faith alone (*not* that of Baptism,) to procure damnation: for a sincere believer might peradventure fail to be baptized.

With a view to this connection of Baptism with Justifying Faith, the Fathers lavish all the wealth of language in describing its effects. They call it "a ransom for captives, a death of sin, a regeneration of the soul, a luminous robe, a holy unbroken seal, a chariot to heaven, a pleasant paradise, a pledge of the kingdom, a gift of adoption;"<sup>m</sup> "a living unto virtues, a death unto sins, an immortal birth, a getting of the kingdom of heaven, a haven of innocence, a shipwreck of sins."<sup>n</sup> It surely must be evident that all this cannot apply

<sup>b</sup> S. Matth. xxviii. 19.

<sup>i</sup> S. John iii. 3.

<sup>j</sup> De Baptismo, c. 13, p. 229.

<sup>k</sup> Cateches. iii. §. 2, p. 36.

<sup>l</sup> De Spiritu Sancto, c. 12, Tom. II. p. 170.

<sup>m</sup> S. Cyrill. Hierosol. in Præfatione, §. 10, p. 12.

<sup>n</sup> S. Optatus, Lib. v. p. 84.

to Baptism as administered to Infants, without taking in the consequences of Justifying Faith, whensoever and howsoever that comes to operate within them. They are truly and without any hypothesis or charitable judgment termed Regenerate, because they receive by baptism remission from the *guilt* of original sin; so that "it is certain by God's Word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved."° Thorndike will have "the professing of faith to God for the undergoing of Christianity" to be "that faith which alone justifies." (*Of the Cov. of Gr. Bk. II. c. vii. p. 89.*) If so, in the case of infants, the engagement is incomplete, as needing their own personal recognition of it. Mark then the goodness of God, Who holds Himself bound to a compact which the other party hath not actually confirmed. Something is needed to enforce a promissory engagement; and that is living inward faith, actuated by love, bringing the man into subjection to the law of God. S. Cyprian describes the experience of the baptismal New Birth and Justifying Faith in the baptized adult. "But after that, the stain of the former life having been wiped off by aid of the regenerating water, light from above poured down into an expiated and pure heart; after that, having drunk the SPIRIT from heaven, the second birth repaired me into a new man, straightway in a wonderful manner dubious things began to confirm themselves, things shut up opened, dark things became light; what before seemed difficult gave ease; what seemed impossible appeared possible; what before was subject to sins confessed it had been earthy; that which the HOLY SPIRIT now loved began to be GOD'S. You know yourself doubtless and recognise with me, what that death of sins and life of virtues took away from us and what it conferred."ª

§. 5. Hence it appears, that whereas Baptismal Regeneration is in itself an *inchoate act*, implying in adults a justifying though not a perfected Faith; in the case of infants, it does not imply the presence of justifying Faith, (of which they are incapable, as they are of hope and charity), but rather the remission of original sin and incorporation into the visible

Regeneration in Baptism inchoate.

° Rubric, Baptism. Office.

ª S. Cyprian. Ad Donatum, p. 3.

Church. “ ‘ Beloved, now are we the sons of GOD, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.’ ”<sup>a</sup> This likeness now *begins* to be re-fashioned, as long as a man is being renewed from day to day according to the image of Him Who created Him.”<sup>r</sup> “ And by that sacred laver the renewing of the new man is begun, so that by advancing it may be perfected, in some sooner, in others later ; many however proceed into a new life, if one regards it in a loving spirit.”<sup>s</sup> So Lancelotti defines Baptism to be “ an outward washing of the body, which, with the employment of a certain form of words, designates the inward ablution of the soul. For as Circumcision in GOD’s people, being appointed for a seal of faith and righteousness, availed to signify the cleansing of original sin in children ; so also Baptism *begins* to avail to the renewing of Man.”<sup>t</sup>

Baptism  
why con-  
ferred on  
infants in-  
capable of  
Justifying  
Faith.

§. 6. Impressed by the circumstances, which indicate the presence of Justifying Faith, in many cases of Baptism recorded in Scripture, Tertullian pleads in favour of delaying the application of that holy Sacrament, until the recipient shall have come to an age when some proof of justification may be previously given. “ According to each person’s condition and disposition, even age,” he writes, “ the delay of Baptism is more useful : chiefly however as relates to children. For what need is there to expose sponsors even to peril, since they themselves may both fail their engagements by reason of mortality, and be deceived by the growth of an evil disposition. The LORD saith indeed, ‘ Forbid them not to come unto Me.’ ”<sup>u</sup> Let them come then, when they grow up ; let them come, when they learn, provided they are taught whither they come ; let them become Christians, when they are able to know CHRIST. Why doth the age of innocence hasten to the remission of sins ? It will be more cautiously done, that, whom in secular matters we trust not earthly substance, to him the Divine be not intrusted. Let them know how to

<sup>a</sup> 1 S. John iii. 2.  
S. Aug. De Spiritu et Littera,  
c. 22, §. 37, Tom. X. p. 105.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* De Moribus Ecclesiæ Ca-

tholicæ, Lib. i. c. 35, §. 80, Tom. I.  
p. 716.

<sup>s</sup> Joan. Pauli Lancelotti Instt.  
Juris Canonici, Lib. ii. Tit. 3, p. 45.

<sup>t</sup> S. Matth. xix. 14.

seek salvation, that you may seem to give to him that seeketh. For no less reason are the unmarried also put off, in whose case trial has been prepared, for virgins by maturity, for widows by bereavement, until they either marry or are confirmed in continence. If any understand the weight of Baptism, they will rather dread obtaining than delaying it: Faith, being sound, is secure touching salvation.”<sup>v</sup>

But the Catholic Church has practically decided otherwise; first, because of the example set in the old Dispensation of circumcising infants as well as adults, an example to which our LORD Himself, Who instituted Baptism, conformed in His own person: secondly, because the age of infancy is innocent, not absolutely, but comparatively only; and “the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam” is such, “that in every person born into this world it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation;”<sup>w</sup> [Thorndike would confine the sense of these words to ‘the loss of the salvation which Adam forfeited:’ but see above, chap. xii. §. 4. (*Of the Cov. of Grace*, c. XX. §. 43.)] and therefore is to be remedied by holy Baptism, that infants also may “be made heirs of everlasting salvation,”<sup>x</sup> when they be not yet capable of faith:<sup>y</sup> thirdly, because the institution of sponsors, while it bears witness to something that is yet lacking to the perfection of the sacrament, that is, the present active faith of the recipient, yet somehow professes to supply the defect. So Lancelotti: “Nor yet, because the virtue of Baptism is contained in the faith of the heart, doth the water of salvation therefore the less wash children, who cannot believe by reason of their age; when \* \* being baptized in the faith of their parents and of the Church, while another makes the profession of faith, they may rightly be called Faithful on account of the sacrament of faith. And when Circumcision was conferred as well on adults as on children according to the LORD’S commandment,

<sup>v</sup> Tert. De Baptismo, c. 18, p. 231.

<sup>w</sup> Article IX.

<sup>x</sup> Office of Baptism.

<sup>y</sup> Such is S. Augustine’s view, where he says, “Qui per ætatem

parvulam nec credere potuerunt, sed ab originali noxa solo possent lavacro regenerationis absolvi.” De Ccceptione et Gratia, c. 7, §. 12. Tom. X. p. 756.

lest Baptism, which succeeds into its room and yet is more general, (since men as well as women are baptized), should seem to be of less effect, it is to be conferred on adults and children equally."\*

Of the  
effects of  
Baptism in  
cases where  
Justifying  
Faith is  
subsequent.

§. 7. Are we then to suppose, that, because a portion of the regenerating effects of Baptism is as it were held in suspense and at present inoperative by reason of the absence of Justifying Faith in the infant recipient, therefore Baptism has no connection with that faith, when the said faith is quickened in the same individual, either when he first becomes conscious of the work of grace, or when as a penitent he is converted and sitteth at the feet of JESUS, 'clothed' with His righteousness, "and in his right mind?"\* I answer with Augustine: "Sins are remitted in the Church in three modes, in Baptism, in Prayer, in the greater humility of Penance: yet GOD doth not remit sins save to the baptized. The very sins which He first remits He remits not save to the baptized. When? When they are baptized. The sins which are afterwards remitted to those that pray and repent, to whom He remits, He remits to them being baptized. For how say they 'Our FATHER,' who are not yet born? As long as they are catechumens, all their sins are upon them. If catechumens, how much more pagans? how much more

\* Lancelotti Instt. Jur. Can. L. ii. Tit. 3, p. 46. I have in the text purposely omitted the clause, "cum et ii, non per usum, sed per habitum fidei, quem suscipiunt in baptismo, credere non male credentur, etc.;" because it introduces the scholastic doctrine of infused habits of virtues. It may be observed, however, that Augustine has something that sounds like it: "Insuper eos etiam cum fletu reluctantare videmus, quando baptizantur et divina sacramenta percipiunt; quod eis ad magnum impietatis peccatum imputaretur, si jam libero uterentur arbitrio: et tamen haret etiam in reluctantibus gratia." (De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, c. 22, §. 44, T. X. p. 742.) But it may be doubted, whether he does not allude to the practice of giving the Eucharist to infants; as, where he

says, "Dicerent enim prorsus nullum esse originale peccatum, sed pro suis futuris, si viverent, meritis vel baptizari vel non baptizari eos qui de corpore solvuntur infantes; et pro suis futuris meritis eos vel accipere vel non accipere corpus et sanguinem Christi, sine quo vitam prorsus accipere non possunt." (De Prædest. Sanctorum, c. 13, §. 25, Tom. X. p. 807.) The notion of the vicarious faith of the sponsors, as representing the faith which they promise on the infant's behalf, receives countenance from the following passage from the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox; ἀξιοῦνται δὲ τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν τῇ πλοτεῖ τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτισματι. *Apud S. Justin Martyris Opp. p. 424.*

\* S. Mark v. 15.

heretics? But we do not make heretics change their baptism. Why? Because they have baptism in such wise as a deserter (from the army) has his mark (or *character*). So they too have baptism; they have it, but so as to be condemned, not crowned. And yet if the deserter being corrected begins to serve, doth any one venture to change his mark?"<sup>b</sup> "So they who are tolerated with a sigh within the pale of the Church, although they belong not to the unity of the Dove and to that glorious Church that hath not spot or wrinkle or any such thing, yet if they be corrected and confess they came to baptism most evil men, they are not re-baptized, but *begin* to belong to the Dove; through whose moanings sins are loosed, while to those that are alienated from her peace they are retained."<sup>c</sup>

<sup>b</sup> De Symbolo, c. 8, §. 15, Tom. VI. p. 556.

<sup>c</sup> S. Aug. De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. iii. c. 18, §. 23, Tom. IX. p. 118 — In explanation of the character impressed in Baptism Durandus cites the following definition; "It is not any absolute nature, but a sole relation of reason, whereby according to Divine institution or compact a person is deputed to sacred actions." "Cum igitur character sit id quo homo efficitur minister sacramentorum vel susceptivus eorum, patet, quod character non est nisi relatio rationis ex ordinatione vel pactione Divina. Et istud videtur convenientius: quum enim scriptum sit Ecclesiastici 24, 'Qui elucidant Me, vitam eternam habebunt,' ad ea quæ sunt fidei, quum sint satis obscura de se, non est conveniens adducere vias obscuras et quæ plus habent obscuritatis et difficultatis quam principale propositum. Sic est de virtute quæ ponitur inhærens sacramentis, et de characterē. Dicere autem, quod res naturales habent rationem sacramenti et homo rationem ministri ex sola institutione et ordinatione Dei, Qui solus dat gratiam et omnem effectum spiritualem quem recipit suscipiens sacramenta, nihil difficultatis continet apud fideles. Beatus etiam

Dionysius, a quo prima traditio characteris nobis advenit, videtur idem sentire cum eo quod dictum est de characterē. Recitat enim quemdam ritum, qui observabatur in primitiva Ecclesia, quando adulti baptizabantur. Tunc enim accedenti ad baptismum hierarcha, id est, pontifex et manum imponebat et signabat eum signo crucis; et præcipiebat eum adscribi inter nomina Christianorum, ut de cætero cum aliis ad Divina admitteretur. Et iste ritus exterior cum baptismo erat characterizatio sua, nec de alio characterē locutus est Dionysius." Durand. in Lib. iv. Sent. Dist. 4, qu. 1, §. 11. The rite of signing with the sign of the Cross, retained by the Church of England in connection with Baptism, was really a portion of the sacrament of Confirmation, as practised with ointment in the primitive Church, when it immediately followed Baptism, as will be seen from this passage; ἐπὶ τὴν ἱεράρχην ἀθθὶς ἀπάγουσιν. Ὁ δὲ τῷ θεουργικῷ τῷ μύρῳ τὸν ἄνδρα σφραγισάμενος μέτοχον ἀποφαίνει λοιπὸν τῆς ἱεροτελεστικῆς τῆς Εὐχαριστίας. (S. Dionys. Areopagita, De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, cap. 2, p. 79.) See also De Sacramentis, Lib. ii. c. 7, §. 14, ap. S. Ambr. Tom. II. p. 360.

Effects of  
Baptism in  
the *titular*  
Elect.

§. 8. In the case of those whom I have styled the *titular* Elect, that is, false professors, we are obliged to discriminate between Justification and Baptismal Regeneration, and to pronounce that the latter is confined in its effects to the remission of original sin and doth not expand into the "new birth unto righteousness." Thus Augustine asks; "For what doth it profit a man, that he is baptized, *if he is not justified*? Hath not He Who said, 'Except a man be born of water and of the SPIRIT, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,'<sup>d</sup> Himself also said, 'Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.'<sup>e</sup> Why fearing the former do many haste to be baptized, and by not fearing the latter care not to be justified?"<sup>f</sup> S. Prosper also limits the effect of Baptism in the reprobate to the remission of original sin: "He who saith that the grace of Baptism being received doth not take away original sin from those who have not been predestinated to life is not a Catholic. For the Sacrament of Baptism, whereby all sins are entirely blotted out, is real even in them who are not going to continue in the Truth and therefore have not been predestinated unto very life."<sup>g</sup> So also the African Bishops; "GOD showed in Jacob the mercy of His gratuitous goodness, but in Esau the judgment of His just severity; who, having indeed received the sacrament of Circumcision on the eighth day according to the tenor of the Divine constitution, was quit of the guilt of original sin ("reatu peccati originalis caruit,") but through the wickedness of his heart continued in the old man; being left there by His judgment, Who freely saves and justly condemns. In whose person have been signified, not those only who deny the faith, but also those who, being placed within the Church, persevere in evil deeds to the end of their life. Of whom the Apostle saith, 'They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.'<sup>h</sup>

<sup>d</sup> S. John iii. 5.

<sup>e</sup> S. Matt. v. 20.

<sup>f</sup> De Civitate Dei, Lib. xxi. c. 27, §. 3, Tom. VII. p. 651.

<sup>g</sup> Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum, in Append. ad S. Aug. Tom.

X. p. 205.

<sup>h</sup> Gal. v. 21.—Epist. Synodica Epp. Africanorum, §. 11, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1596.—S. John Damascene seems to make a like distinction: 'Η μὲν οὖν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν

§. 9. I would add, that in a well authenticated case of <sup>Of Conver-</sup> true *conversion* of a sinner, as for example that of S. John-of-God, (*Sanct. Cath.* p. 126,) the visible change is but the first manifestation *in time* of God's act *in eternity*, namely, His predestination and election; and, in order to its operation, requires the seal of Baptism appointed by God to precede or follow it. (See also the case of Blessed Joachim abbat, *ibid.* p. 265.) In the Life of S. Elzear of Sabran (*ibid.* p. 390,) may be found a case of what would be termed by some moderns *Conversion*, but wrongly; unless they would confound the Pentecostal unction of the Apostles with their first call by JESUS. The principle of Analogy, as taught us by Bishop Butler, is opposed to the notion of a *sudden* conversion. There is a law of *continuity* in the spiritual, as in the natural world. Nature doth nothing by fits and starts. So that a leap from one state to another infinitely different from it cannot be natural. A remarkable perception (as is that of a spiritual conversion) is, in truth, the outcome of other perceptions, which have escaped notice, but which conspired to the result.

ἅφεςις πᾶσιν ὁμοίως διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος δίδεται· ἡ δὲ χάρις τοῦ Πνεύματος κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς προκαθάρσεως. De Orth. Fide, cap. 86. S. Augustine writes; "Non esse consequens ut quisquis habet baptismum Christi etiam de pecca-

torum remissione securus sit; si hoc in sacramento tantum habet, nec veraci cordis conversione conversus est, ut dimittenti dimittetur." (De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. vi. Tom. IX. p. 179.)



## CHAPTER XXI.

## OF SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS.

Of Good  
Works or  
the Merits  
of the  
Saints.

§. 1. It is clear from what has been before stated concerning Predestination and Election, that any notion of human merit as forming a ground or antecedent reason for the salvation of the Elect is contrary to the truth of their having been chosen according to GOD's purpose before the foundation of the world. Indeed no statement can be so express against any idea of foreseen merit as that of S. Paul: "When Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of GOD according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with GOD? GOD forbid. For He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of GOD that showeth mercy."<sup>1</sup> "That is the peculiar and inveterate venom of the Pelagians," writes Pope Gelasius, "whereby they think that the grace of GOD can be conferred according to men's deserts; the which be it far from Christian minds, when the Apostle testifies, Grace 'is no more of works. But if it be of works, then is it no more of grace,'<sup>2</sup> because a reward is rendered back, not bestowed *gratuitously*, whence *grace* has got its name. For what Christian may dare say that he hath any good without grace? when the Teacher of the Gentiles cries out, briefly

<sup>1</sup> Rom. ix. 10 -16.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. xi. 6.

concluding all within himself (to be) gifts; ‘By the grace of GOD I am what I am, and His grace in me was not in vain;’ to show that he himself had not preceded the gift of grace, but had followed it; and to show that by following he was a co-operator with grace, (he adds,) ‘But I laboured more abundantly than they all.’ And again, fearing lest he should seem to presume about himself, he added; ‘Yet not I, but the grace of GOD which was with me.’<sup>k</sup> He said not, I and the grace of GOD with me; but He made grace precede, and subjoined it. But what can be had without grace, when Faith itself is by grace? the same Apostle teaching us, ‘But I obtained mercy.’<sup>l</sup> Nor is Divine mercy aught else but grace.”<sup>m</sup> “No one hath aught of his own but falsehood and sin,” saith the Second Council of Orange, quoting S. Augustine; “but if any man hath any truth and righteousness, it is from that well, which we should thirst for in this wilderness; that, being thereby bedewed as if with some drops, we faint not on the way.”<sup>n</sup>

But it may occur to some as an apparent contradiction to this, that there are passages of Scripture, which seem to directly countenance some notion of merit in the good works of the Saints and their labours for CHRIST’S sake. Such are the following: “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the LORD, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.”<sup>o</sup> “For GOD is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have showed toward His Name, in that ye have ministered to the Saints, and do minister.”<sup>p</sup> “Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward.”<sup>q</sup> “And, behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be.”<sup>r</sup>

Now if, as Bucer once remarked at the Conference at Ratisbon, A.D. 1546, by the term *Merit* be meant only ‘to do in

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 10.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Tim. i. 13.

<sup>m</sup> Gelasii P.P. I. Epist. 7, *ap.*  
Labbe. T. IV. p. 1179.

<sup>n</sup> Conc. Arausican. ii. Can. 22,

*ap.* Labbe, T. IV. p. 1670.

<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 8.

<sup>p</sup> Heb. vi. 10.

<sup>q</sup> 2 S. John. 8.

<sup>r</sup> Rev. xxii. 12.

consequence of the faith of God's grace the good works which God hath promised to reward and which He repays,' we will by no means condemn the use thereof in that sense." <sup>s</sup> This is precisely S. Augustine's view. "If," he says, "they (the Pelagians) were so to understand our merits, as to recognise them also to be God's gifts, that sentiment would not be blameworthy: but since they so preach up human merits as to say that a man has them from himself, the Apostle altogether answers most rightly; 'For who distinguisheth thee from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?'" <sup>t</sup> Certainly to one who thinks so it is most truly said; 'God crowns His own gifts, not thy merits, if thy merits come to thee from thyself but not from Him. For if these be such (that is, thine), they are evil ones, which God crowns not; but if they are good, they are God's gifts; because, as the Apostle James saith, 'Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the FATHER of lights.'<sup>u</sup> Whence also John the forerunner of the LORD saith, 'A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven;' <sup>v</sup> from heaven certainly, whence also came the HOLY SPIRIT, when JESUS ascended up on high, led captivity captive, gave gifts to men. If then thy good merits are God's gifts, God crowns not thy merits, as thine, but as His own gifts.'" <sup>w</sup> If 'Merits' be thought of as supplementing the free, unpurchased grace of CHRIST, we should reject the term as well as the notion. But it signifies the 'earnings' procured in the traffic of Christianity; the *interest* which the LORD looks for at the hands of those to whom He hath committed 'talents.' Therefore I conclude we may not safely discard the term, lest we gainsay the obvious meaning of the Parable of the Talents, and scout the teaching of the Western Church, to please peevish moderns. So that, whether they be 'merits' or 'good works,' the glory of God cannot be obscured by any consideration of that

\* See Joan. Barnesii Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, Paralipomena ad §. 5, *ap.* Fascicul. Rerum, Tom. II. p. 845.

<sup>1</sup> Cor. iv. 7.

<sup>s</sup> S. James i. 17.

<sup>t</sup> S. John iii. 27.

<sup>u</sup> S. Aug. De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, c. 6, §. 15, Tom. X. p. 725.

which is grounded on the merit of CHRIST and “expresseth the tincture of His Blood.” (Thornd. *Of the Cov. of Gr.* c. XXXIII. §. 16.)

Nor was this sound doctrine forgotten even at a period, when the merits of the Saints rang in the ears of Christendom. For thus writes William of Paris; “Our works are also God’s works, which Himself worketh in us and through us; not indeed as by instruments only. For then good works would not be imputed to us for praise or discredit nor for blame or merit; as no blame or merit is imputed to a harp or pipe on the part of those who play on them. In us then God works His own and our good works, not so much by affording power, facility, and opportunity, as by exciting us by external teachings and the imitations of His benefits and consolations, by the prickings also of scourges; and sometimes by compulsions and inward inspirations and revelations, terrors, and other manifold means, which are known to Him alone, and those to whom He wills to reveal them. Not only then are we fellow-workers, but also workers; although this be by the gift of grace itself. Nor is it less meritorious on this account, because a good work is a grace of God; yea, it is even more so; since therefore it is better and more acceptable to God.”\*

§. 2. Connected with the merits or good works of the Saints is the question touching their perfectibility in this life; and many texts of Scripture clearly imply the possibility of such an issue. The most striking perhaps are these: “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your FATHER which is in heaven is perfect.”† “That the man of GOD may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”‡ “Whosoever is born of GOD doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: because he is born of GOD.”§ Whereupon the judgment of the Council of Milevis is as follows: “If the case stands thus, that by the grace of the SAVIOUR we make progress indeed in this life, while desire subsides and charity increases; but are perfected in the other life, when desire is

Of the Perfectibility of Saints.

\* Guillelmus Parisiensis, De Meritis, O. p. fol. clxi. Ed. Paris. 1516.

† S. Matt. v. 48.

‡ 2 Tim. iii. 17.

§ 1 S. John iii. 9.

extinct and charity complete; doubtless that which is written, 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin,' has been said agreeably to that very charity, which alone doth not commit sin. For to the birth which is of GOD belongeth the charity which is to be augmented and perfected, not that desire which is to be minished and consumed: which however, as long as it is in our members, by a certain law of its own is repugnant to the law of the mind. But he that is born of GOD, and that obeys not his desires, nor yields his members unto sin, may say, 'Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.'<sup>b</sup> But whichever way that question stands, although man is not found in this life without sin, it may however be said to be possible by the aid of grace and of the SPIRIT of GOD, (which that it may be done we should endeavour after and pray); nor is it impiety but human error to affirm, that this is to be wished for, even though one cannot exhibit what one affirms. For he believes that that may take place, which it is at least laudable to wish. But to us it is sufficient, that none of the faithful in the Church of GOD is found, of whatever excellent advancement and righteousness, who may dare to say that the petition in the LORD'S Prayer 'Forgive us our trespasses' is not necessary to him; or saith, that he hath no sin, lest he deceive himself and the truth be not in him."<sup>c</sup> S. Augustine appears to hold that, while it is barely possible a man may through grace be sinless, it was more likely no man is without sin. (*De Spiritu et Litera*, c. 1.) Touching the Virgin Mary he would have no question raised as to sin. (*De Natura et Gratia*, c. 36. See my *Sanctorale Cath.* p. 475.) Having cited the Tridentine decree (canon 22) on the subject, Thorndike knows not "what Church holdeth that the blessed Virgin never sinned." The fact of the Greek Church styling her *Pan-agia* ('All holy') looks like a consent of East and West, as to her having been preserved from sin. Pope Gelasius says; "But after what manner he that is born of GOD cannot sin, let the inspired man himself rather expound; 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves,' 'that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar;' 'but if we

<sup>b</sup> Rom. vii. 17.

<sup>c</sup> Conc. Milev. ii. Epist. ad Innocent. P.P. ap. Labbe. T. II. p. 1552

confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' <sup>d</sup> He has explained how he who is born of GOD cannot sin; that, as a believer, being born of GOD, ought not to pronounce that he hath no sin; so the sin, which he may have actually contracted, being removed by a confident absolution, cannot be in him; as he proceeds, adding; 'These things I write unto you, that ye sin not. But if any man sin, we have an advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' " •

§. 3. But while we may not deny the riches of CHRIST'S grace, or presume to set bounds to the transforming power of the HOLY GHOST over the heart of redeemed humanity, it is safer to follow the line of asserting the imperfection of the Saints, who "have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of GOD, and not of us." <sup>f</sup> "Whether any such persons may have existed, who might arrive even at this perfection in the present life; as it is nowhere evidently asserted, so it is not meet we should easily either affirm or deny; and it is more sober to learn how far we ought to measure the progress of the present life from the words of the holy Prophets and Apostles themselves, than whom forsooth in this world, as far as pertains to the institution of holy living, it is plain that nothing was or is more excellent. Who, although by the more copious bounty of GOD they were assailed by either altogether rare or the least passions of human nature, and by the more affluent grace of GOD easily overcame the vices of mortality, yet testify they were not so far exempt from them, but that it is peculiar to That Immaculate Lamb to have had no sin at all; lest it should seem not to be reckoned to Him Alone, if any holy man whatsoever be believed to have been free from sin. Let us then be content with the profession of the Saints; and rather hear what they pronounce about themselves than

Of the Imperfection of the Saints.

<sup>d</sup> 1 S. John i. 10, 9.

<sup>e</sup> 1 S. John ii. 1, 2.—Gelasii P.P.

I. Tract. iii. *ap.* Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1250.

<sup>f</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 7.

follow without certain authority what may be rashly ventilated by our opinions." <sup>a</sup>

"We therefore," says Faustus of Riez, "proceeding in a middle course with CHRIST's guidance, after grace, without which we are nothing, assert the labour of dutiful service. But we by all means exclude the arrogance and presumption of labour; so that exerting ourselves with all our strength, lest grace be made void in us, whatsoever we have received of the LORD's hand we pronounce to be a gift, not a reward; knowing that the fruit of our labour itself is a matter of duty, not of merit; saying with the Evangelist, 'We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.' " <sup>b</sup> "They who think rightly," says Augustine, "understand that any man soever, although according to the present condition of human society he may without absurdity be said to live most righteously, yet cannot be without some sin, as long as the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. For although we are now according to faith Children of GOD, according to sight it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. For we are not yet saved in fact but in hope." <sup>c</sup> And elsewhere he reminds us, that "at present on account of the ignorances and infirmities of its members, the whole Church hath cause to say daily, Forgive us our trespasses." <sup>d</sup>

Of Faith and Works.

§. 4. The dreary wrangle raised by divines respecting the share borne in justification by Faith and Works severally may be set aside, and with no loss, if we bear in mind that S. Paul contended against the Judaizing Christians, that we are accounted righteous or 'justified' before GOD, not by 'the works of the Law,' (*Rom. iii. 28.*) such as he himself occasionally practised, (as, when he had "shorn his head at Cenchrea, for he had a vow," (*Acts xviii. 18.*) And again at Jerusalem, (*Acts xxi. 26.*) no, nor yet by the imperfect moral precepts of the Law of Moses, (*S. Matt. v. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43.*) but by 'the law of faith,' (*Rom. iii. 27.*) that is, by Christianity :

<sup>a</sup> Gelasii P.P. I. Tract. iii. *ubi supra*, p. 1240.

<sup>b</sup> S. Luke xvii. 10. — Fausti Reicensis Epist. ad Lucidum. *ap. Labbe*. Tom. IV. p. 1043.

<sup>c</sup> Contra Epist. Parmeniani, Lib. ii. c. 7, §. 14. Tom. IX. p. 33.

<sup>d</sup> *Retract. Lib. ii. c. 18; ubi supra*, p. 78.

and that Christianity, not a religion of the heart merely, that is, confined to secret conviction like that of Nicodemus, but openly professed with "a good conscience toward God" (1 *Peter* iii. 21,) in baptism, and with the purpose "to observe all things whatsoever CHRIST hath commanded." (*S. Matt.* xxviii. 20.) When the disciples of S. Paul in turn came to dwell exclusively on the motives supplied by 'the law of faith' or Christian belief to the neglect of holy obedience, S. James had to remind them that profession without performance was nothing worth; that a man is justified 'not by faith only,' nor by baptism, 'but by works,' (iii. 24,) the doing of the commandments of JESUS, which proves the doers His friends. (*S. John* xv. 14.)



## CHAPTER XXII.

## OF GRACE AND FREE WILL.

The Grace  
of God free  
and uncondi-  
tional.

§. 1. IT is almost superfluous to dwell further on the subject of Grace, inasmuch as it has been insisted on over and over again in treating of Predestination and Election. And the replies to Semi-Pelagian objections have already anticipated much of what might be urged *à fortiori* against the Pelagians. But the argument of the latter that the doctrine of Free Grace interfered with the freedom of the human will and introduced necessity requires some consideration. The statements of the Pelagians practically amounted to this; that "human nature was by itself adequate to the fulfilling of God's commandments." \* To rehearse the texts which may be cited in contradiction of this statement, a volume would not suffice, as the Catholic opponents of the Pelagians justly observe.<sup>1</sup> From this position they also drew two consequences subversive (in the opinion of Catholics) of the very ground of Christianity; <sup>m</sup> first, that GOD was not to be intreated to help us against sin and to work righteousness; secondly, that holy Baptism did not benefit infants towards obtaining eternal life.<sup>n</sup> But, as it is observed by Origen, the nature of the HOLY TRINITY is alone "naturally or substantially holy. If any other nature is holy, it hath its sanctifica-

\* Conc. Carth. ii. contra Pelagianos, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1534.

<sup>1</sup> *e.g.* S. Matth. xi. 27; xvi. 17; S. Luke viii. 10; S. John v. 21; vi. 37, 44; xv. 5, 16; Rom. viii. 26; ix. 16; xii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 25; iv. 7; xii. 3; xv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 5;

iv. 7; Eph. ii. 8; Phil. i. 28; ii. 13.

<sup>m</sup> "Quibus omnino totum quod Christiani sumus conantur evertere." Conc. Milevitan. ii. Epist. ad Innocent. *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1545.

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.*

tion from the inspiration of the HOLY GHOST; not possessing it, from its own nature, but as an accident.”<sup>o</sup> So also Leibniz: “The Will of GOD alone follows the intellect invariably. That of all intelligent creatures is subject to passions, or is led by inadequate ideas. Grace supplies their will with suitable motives, without however impairing their liberty any more than a friend doth by advising or furnishing motives.” (*Théodicée*, Pt. III. §§. 298, 310.)

“As then, when a crop has brought forth good and plentiful fruits to their perfect maturity, no one will with piety say that the husbandman made those fruits, but will confess them to have been supplied by GOD; so also our perfection is not indeed effected when we cease working and are idle, nor yet shall its consummation be ascribed to us, but to GOD, Who is the first and principal Cause of our work. So, when a ship has overcome the dangers of the sea, although the thing be done by much labour of the sailors and expending all the resources of the nautical art and appliance of the study and industry of the pilot, by the blowing also of winds and diligent observation of the stars; if however the ship battered by winds and waves has come safe to port, no one in his senses will ascribe the preservation of the ship except to the mercy of GOD. Yea, not even the sailor or pilot himself dares say, I saved the ship, but refers the whole to GOD’s mercy; not that he feels that he himself hath applied no skill or labour towards preserving the ship, but because he feels that the labour indeed was spent on the ship by himself, but the preservation by GOD. So also in the course of our life labour indeed is to be expended by us and study and industry used, but salvation the fruit of our labour to be hoped for from GOD. Otherwise if He requires nought of our work, His commandments forsooth shall appear to be superfluous; in vain also doth Paul blame some that they have fallen away from the truth, and praise others standing in the faith; superfluously doth he deliver to the Churches certain precepts and institutions; in vain also do we ourselves either will or have recourse to what is good. But it is certain that these things are not done in vain; and it is certain that neither do the Apostles

• Peri Archon, Lib. i. c. 8. Opp. p. 433.

give charge in vain, nor doth the LORD give laws without a cause." <sup>p</sup>

To add the testimony of Liturgies to the freedom and sovereign efficacy of Grace may be superfluous ; but the following will serve to complete what has been already stated. In the Alexandrian Orthodox Liturgy of S. Gregory the priest prays : " For Thou art He that worketh all in all, and we all seek Thy aid and succour in all things." <sup>a</sup> In the Gallican Sacramentary occurs the well-known Collect, " Let Thy mercy always prevent and follow us." <sup>r</sup> In the Canon of the Mass for Epiphany in the Gothic Missal the priest says, " Not presuming on our merit, O LORD, but on that of Thy SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Whom Thou hast sent to deliver us from darkness and the shadow of death, in obedience to Thy commandment. We are unworthy indeed of the name of sons, but are bidden to say, Our FATHER ;" <sup>s</sup> and again in a *Missa Jejunii* ; " Because without Thee we can do nothing that is pleasing to Thee, Thy grace alone will grant us that we may live in a wholesome conversation." <sup>t</sup>

Man's will  
not free to  
work out  
salvation  
without  
Grace.

§. 2. When we speak then of Man's will as insufficient, and use other terms apparently inconsistent with the freedom of the will, and call to mind that the very essence of virtue is taken away if we abstract freedom of choice from an agent ; we must also remember that we are treating of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the will towards doing that which shall win us everlasting life. For in that case and with so tremendous a stake before us the freedom of the will is limited to our acquiescence in the saving inspiration of GOD the HOLY GHOST ; <sup>u</sup> nor do we " acquire sanctity by the power of nature but by the aiding of our purpose through GOD's grace." <sup>v</sup>

But it is objected, that what we read in Scripture of the LORD's hardening Pharaoh's heart seems to go far beyond this, and to make in favour of some decree of Absolute Re-

<sup>p</sup> *Ibid.* Lib. iii c. 2, p. 455.

<sup>a</sup> Renaudot. Liturg. Oriental.

Tom. I. p. 91.

<sup>r</sup> *Ap.* Mab. Mus. Ital. T. I. p. 284.

<sup>s</sup> Mabillon. De Liturg. Gallican. p. 210.

<sup>t</sup> *Ibid.* p. 234.

<sup>u</sup> Gennadius Massiliensis, De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, p. 78.

<sup>v</sup> *Ibid.* p. 80.

probation, that would imply something more than merely a withdrawal of Divine grace, as it is written, "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone;"<sup>w</sup> and, "Every plant which My heavenly FATHER hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind."<sup>x</sup>

Origen endeavours to explain the difficulty by referring to the passage, "For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from GOD: but that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned."<sup>y</sup> "Let us then," he says, "take it, that those signs and virtues which were done by GOD were indeed showers and ministered from above from GOD; but the purpose and wills of men are to be taken for the earth dressed or uncultivated, of one nature indeed as comparing earth with earth, not however of one and the same cultivation. Whence it comes to pass that each man's purpose is either hardened by the virtues and wonders of GOD, if it is uncultivated and wild and barbarous, and becomes more haughty and thorny than it was; but becomes milder and gives itself up to obedience with the whole mind, if it be purged from faults and cultivated. And, for the more evident proof of the thing, it will not be superfluous to use another similitude. For instance, if one were to say, that it is the sun which binds and which melts; whereas melting and constriction are contrary. Yet that which is said will not be false, while by one and the same power of heat the sun melts wax, but dries and binds clay; not that his power operates otherwise in clay and otherwise in wax, but the quality of clay is one, and that of wax another; while, to be sure, by nature it comes to the same thing, since either is of earth. Thus then one and the same operation of GOD, which was conducted through Moses in signs and miracles, convicted indeed Pharaoh's hardness, which he had conceived by the intention of his malice, but declared the obedience of the other Egyptians who were mingled with the Israelites, who are also reported to have come out of Egypt along with the Hebrews.

<sup>w</sup> Hosea iv. 17.

<sup>y</sup> Heb. vi. 7, 8.

<sup>x</sup> S. Matt. xv. 13, 14.

But that which is written, that the house of Pharaoh was subdued by little and little, so that he should once say, 'Go not far away, ye shall go three days' journey, but leave your wives and your little ones and your cattle;' yea, and if there be any thing written besides, whereby he seems to acquiesce by degrees in the signs and miracles, what else is thence indicated, but that the virtue of the signs and wonders wrought somewhat in him, yet not as much as it ought. For if his hardening were such as very many suppose it to have been, he would not be found forsooth to have yielded even to a few."<sup>a</sup>

Of a similar tendency are such texts as, "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of GOD leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of GOD."<sup>b</sup> "O LORD, why hast Thou made us to err from Thy ways, and hardened our heart from Thy fear? Return for Thy servants' sake, the tribes of Thine inheritance."<sup>c</sup>

Alliance of  
Grace and  
Free Will.

§. 3. Although the writers of the Eastern Church do not speak on this subject with that fulness and precision which the Pelagian heresy occasioned in the West, still we have an agreement in the main. Thus Chrysostom expresses himself on the connection of grace and free will: "Hence we learn a great lesson, how a man's purpose is not sufficient, unless he enjoys the impulse from above; and again, that we shall gain nothing from the supernal impulse, where there is no readiness of will. And Judas and Peter demonstrate both these facts. For the former having enjoyed much aid was in no ways benefited, because he would not also contribute his own share; but the latter even having purposed fell, since he enjoyed no aid; inasmuch as virtue is woven out of these two things."<sup>d</sup> Here I would remark, that if GOD allows the operation of His creature, as He doth by not constraining his

<sup>a</sup> Exod. viii. 28, x. 11. Origen is here endeavouring to embrace in one sentence the amount of Pharaoh's concessions.

<sup>b</sup> Peri Archon, L. iii. c. 1, p. 452.

<sup>b</sup> Rom. ii. 3, 4.

<sup>c</sup> Isa. lxiii. 17.

<sup>d</sup> S. Jo. Chrys. in S. Matt. Hom. 53, Opp. Tom. II. p. 513.

will, in other words, by allowing Man freedom of will to admit or reject His grace, and by reserving conditions of salvation, then the apparent failure of GOD's purpose to save all men is no impeachment of His omnipotence, which, by the very allowance of Free Will, He employs not to the extinction of Man's freedom.

Again, if GOD over-rules all choice in Man and the reason that directs it; if He makes them unable to do their work, till He determine them so to do;—then is there the same necessity in the actions of Man as in the laws of the physical universe, which depend on the mere will of GOD; then can there neither be sin nor virtue, nor ground for reward or punishment, and the responsibility for evil is blasphemously thrown on GOD.

In the West the voice of the Church is expressed by Augustine. "The choice of the human will is not sufficient, unless victory be granted by the LORD to him that prays that he may not enter into temptation. But what is more evidently shown than GOD's grace, where that which is prayed for is received? For if our SAVIOUR had said, 'Watch, that ye enter not into temptation,' He would have seemed only to have admonished man's will; but when He has added 'and pray,' He shows that GOD helps that we enter not into temptation. It has been said to free will, 'My son, despise not the chastening of the LORD;'<sup>a</sup> and the LORD hath said, 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.'<sup>f</sup> Man is therefore aided by grace, that it be not enjoined on his will without a cause."<sup>g</sup> "The sole mercy of GOD confers the beginning of salvation, with which the will of man next co-operates in its own salvation; so that the mercy of GOD preventing directs the course of the human will, and the human will obeying (the same mercy attending it) according to its intention runs for the prize. Hereby the human will labours, in that it runs usefully; and should acknowledge that it hath the gift of running and of labour from GOD's mercy, nor be ungrateful to mercy, whereby it receives the beginning of salvation, so as by it to arrive at the full effect of eternal

<sup>a</sup>Prov. iii. 11.  
<sup>f</sup> S. Luke xxii. 32.

<sup>g</sup> S. Aug. De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, c. 4, §. 9. Tom. X. p. 723.

salvation ; because then will it be good, if it is prevented by God's gift, and continue good, if not destitute of His aid. But he errs, whosoever thinketh that it is so given by the LORD, as a person gives money when he has got a fit security ; whereas the LORD doubtless both confers the pledge of the HOLY SPIRIT on whom He wills, and distributes His money to the care and duty of His servants as to money-changers, to be ' required,' as He Himself saith in the Gospel." <sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> S. Luke xix. 23.—Epist. Synod. Epp. Africanorum, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. IV. p. 1597.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

## OF SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

§. 1. INASMUCH as it hath pleased GOD to "knit together" His "Elect in one communion and fellowship, in the mystical body of" His "SON CHRIST our LORD," and as it belongs to the very notion of a society that it should have its external tokens to distinguish its members from those outside its pale; so we find certain ordinances "ordained of CHRIST" to "be badges or tokens of Christian men's profession."<sup>1</sup> The first of these is Baptism, which is "a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened."<sup>2</sup> And thus Augustine writes, that our LORD JESUS CHRIST "gathered together the society of His new people by Sacraments, in number most few, in observance most easy, in signification most excellent, as Baptism consecrated in the name of the TRINITY, the Communion of His Body and Blood, and if aught else is commended in Canonical Scriptures."<sup>3</sup> These ordinances obtained in the West the name of *Sacraments*; int he first instance, I am persuaded, from the resemblance of the initiatory rite of Baptism, wherein the Christian pledged his fidelity to CHRIST, to the ceremony attending the Roman soldier's taking the oath of loyalty to his commander.<sup>4</sup> But, as the military oath

Of the  
nature of  
Sacraments.

<sup>1</sup> Article XXV.

<sup>2</sup> Article XXVII.

<sup>3</sup> S. Aug. Ep. ad Januarium (54.) Tom. II p 124.

<sup>4</sup> Thus Tertullian: "Si omnia propter diabolum instituta, et ex diaboli rebus instructa monstravimus: (nihil enim non diaboli est, vel quidquid Dei non est, vel Deo displicet;) hoc erit pompa diaboli,

adversus quam in signaculo fide ejeramus. Atquin hinc vel maxime intelligunt factum Christianum, de repudio spectaculorum. Itaque negat manifeste, qui per quod agnoscitur tollit. Quid autem spei superest hujusmodi homini? nemo in castra hostium transit nisi projectis armis suis, nisi destitutis signis et sacramentis principis sui, nisi



or *sacramentum* served to express the fidelity which it was intended to secure, and the *signaculum* or seal stood in the place of and represented the service whereof it was the symbol; so the term *sacramenta* was applied to designate, not only the Divine ordinances in their external relation, but also the very essence and hidden virtue whereof they were the outward symbols. Accordingly a Sacrament is not only "a sign or token of a sacred thing or object," but also "a visible form of an invisible grace;"<sup>m</sup> "in such wise, that, bearing its resemblance, it also becomes" instrumentally, "a cause thereof."<sup>n</sup> For Sacraments "be not only badges, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him."<sup>o</sup> "Therefore," says Augustine, "are they called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another is understood. That which is seen hath a bodily show, that which is understood hath a spiritual fruit."<sup>p</sup> And with respect to their representative character he elsewhere says; "Was not CHRIST once sacrificed in Himself, and yet in a mystery (*in sacramento*) He is being sacrificed for the people, not only throughout all Easter solemnities, but every day; nor indeed doth he say untruly, who being asked shall reply that He is being sacrificed? For if Sacraments had not a certain resemblance to those things whereof they be Sacraments, they would cease to be Sacraments. But from this resemblance they generally receive even the names of the things themselves. As then according to a certain mode the Sacrament of the Body of CHRIST is the Body of CHRIST, the Sacrament of the Blood of CHRIST is the Blood of CHRIST, so the Sacrament of Faith is Faith."<sup>q</sup>

pactus simul perire." (De Spectaculis, c. 24.) The metaphor 'signaculum fidei' is borrowed from military language, as may be seen from the Acts of the Passion of S. Maximilianus; where the Proconsul Dion says, "Milita, et accipe signaculum, ne misere pereas. Maximilianus respondit: Non pereo. Nomen meum jam ad Dominum meum est. Non possum militare." (Ruinart. Acta Martt. p.

310.) So are the formulæ, 'Ἀποδοσθαι τῷ Σατανᾷ συντάσσομαι τῷ Χριστῷ.

<sup>m</sup> Petrus Lombardus, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Lancelotti Instt. Juris Canonici, L. ii. tit. 2.

<sup>o</sup> Article XXV.

<sup>p</sup> S. Aug. Sermon. 272, Tom. V. p. 1104.

<sup>q</sup> S. Aug. Epist. 98, ad Bonifacium, Tom. II. p. 267.

But it must be borne in mind, that "the name of Sacrament is more properly said of the sign than of the thing signified; because the thing signified is not called Sacrament, unless because it is represented by a sign secret or secretly represented, so that hereby it be a secret thing."<sup>r</sup> But from the close connection of the sign with the thing signified thereby, the term *sacramentum* came to be used for any secret, especially of a Divine character; "for a sign of a thing hidden and secret, and chiefly one that is sacred and foreseen or ordained of God; as the dream of Nebuchadnezzar concerning the image which he saw is called a *sacrament* (or 'secret') in Daniel ii. 18; where it is said, that Daniel exhorted his companions, 'that they would desire mercies of the God of heaven concerning this secret (*super sacramento isto*):' because that dream signified the hidden ordinance of GOD touching the progress of the four kingdoms and their destruction by the kingdom of CHRIST."<sup>s</sup> We are thus brought to the point, where the term 'Sacrament' becomes convertible with the Greek term 'Mystery,' which has been employed by the Eastern Church to mark the ordinances appointed by CHRIST and His Apostles in the Church. In very early times it had become customary to use the term 'Sacrament' with a large latitude; as may be proved by Tertullian's applying it to our LORD'S Name,<sup>t</sup> to His Passion,<sup>u</sup> to His Resurrection;<sup>v</sup> to mention no more.

But, to confine the term 'Sacrament' to designate the ordinances of CHRIST, perhaps the fullest definition that can be given is that of Hugo De S. Victore; "A Sacrament is something material, from its institution signifying, and by resemblance representing, and from its sanctification containing spiritual grace: which may be otherwise stated; A Sacrament is a sign instituted by CHRIST to signify and confer spiritual grace, which by a certain resemblance it represents."<sup>w</sup> When it is stated above, that a Sacrament, bearing a resemblance

<sup>r</sup> Durand. in Sent. L. iv. Dist. I. qu. 1.

<sup>s</sup> *Ibid.* So in the Latinity of Tertullian, "Et utique crediderat, et omnia sacramenta cognoverat vas electionis, Doctor nationum,"

(De Resurrectione Carnis, c. 23.) in allusion to 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

<sup>t</sup> Adv. Marcion. L. iii. c. 7.

<sup>u</sup> Adv. Judæos, c. 10.

<sup>v</sup> De Resurrect. Carnis, c. 21.

<sup>w</sup> Consultatio Cassandri, c. 13.

to that which it represents, becomes a cause thereof, it is intended to express the fact, that it is independent of the faith or intention of the ministrant or recipient, although the right faith and intention of both parties is implied in the *due use* of Sacraments; "and is effectual, because of CHRIST's institution and promise, although ministered by evil men." \* It is not only "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us," but also "a means whereby we receive the same." † And so the Sacraments of the New Law not only signify but cause grace. Principally GOD alone can cause grace; because grace is nothing else than a certain participated resemblance of the Divine Nature, according to that of 2 Peter, c. i. v. 4. 'Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature.' But instrumentally the Sacraments cause grace. For they are applied to men in pursuance of a Divine ordinance to cause grace in them. ‡

To avoid misconception, I would add, that "there is not in Sacraments any virtue such as to cause a grace of character or any disposition whatsoever or ornament existing in the soul; but they operate so that without them grace is not conferred; because of Divine compact it comes to pass, that he that receives the Sacrament receives grace, unless he hinders it; and that not from the Sacrament, but from GOD, Who alone reaches to the character, grace, or ornament whatsoever, if there be aught in the soul." §

Of the two  
chief Sacra-  
ments of the  
Gospel.

§. 2. "In this at least," says Cassander, "there is no controversy, that there are two chief Sacraments of our salvation, to wit, Holy Baptism and the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the LORD; but we do not read of the other Sacraments being comprehended by the more ancient writers under any certain number; nor likely may you find any one before Peter Lombard, who set down any definite number of Sacraments; to determine which number (of seven) the mystery of this number, most celebrated even in sacred Scrip-

\* Article XXVI.

† Catechism.

‡ S. Tho. Summæ Pars iii. qu. 62, art. 1.

§ Durand. in Sent. iv. Dist. I. qu. 4. §. 19. He calls it "*opinio antiqua et sine calumnia, et magis ut mihi videtur consonat dictis Sanctorum.*"

ture, seems to have led later writers." <sup>b</sup> But he was deceived ; for F. Georges De Rhodes, a Jesuit, inveighs against the Lutheran Chemnitz as most impudent in asserting that the Master of the Sentences was the first inventor of this number. That the idea of seven Sacraments had imperceptibly become familiar to men's minds before Lombard's time may possibly be true ; but the fact remains, that he is the first systematizer of Theology, who has distinctly enunciated the number of *seven* Sacraments. But De Rhodes refers us to Cardinal Bellarmine as bringing most evident vouchers from the Fathers. <sup>c</sup> His citations from the Fathers however go to the extent of proving, not that any one of them enumerated precisely seven Sacraments, neither more nor less ; but that some one or more has attributed the name and dignity of Sacrament to one or other of 'the five commonly called Sacraments,' to wit, Confirmation or Chrism, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony. <sup>d</sup> But when we examine the statements of a writer, like S. Cyril of Jerusalem, for example, who treats professedly in his *Mystagogic Catecheses* of the Christian Mysteries or Sacraments, we find that he treats only of Baptism and the Eucharist. He does indeed mention the Chrism, but it is in connection with Baptism. So also Tertullian. S. John Damascene, in the eighth century, and writing a comprehensive summary of Theology, devotes one chapter to Baptism (c. 86.), another to the Holy Mysteries of the Eucharist (c. 90.), none to the other Sacraments ; and this, while he can find room for the Cross (c. 88.), for Praying towards the East (c. 89.), for Images (c. 93.), and for the honour due to the Saints and their relics (c. 92.) S. Isidore of Seville, in one place, interposes Chrism and Confirmation after Baptism ; <sup>e</sup> but elsewhere he couples together only Baptism and the Communion. <sup>f</sup>

But, to exhibit the tradition of classing together these two as the great Sacraments of the Gospel, it will be enough

<sup>b</sup> Consult. Cassandri, c. 13.

<sup>c</sup> F. Geo. De Rhodes, à Soc. Jesu, Disp. I. De Sacramentis, qu. I. §. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Bellarmini Opp. Tom. III. De

Effectu Sacramentorum, Lib. ii. c. 24.

<sup>e</sup> De Officiis Ecclesiasticis, Lib. ii. c. xxv. xxvi.

<sup>f</sup> Sententiarum Lib. I. c. 24. 'De Baptismo et Communione.'

to give a few examples in different centuries. Thus Augustine writes: "But at this time, after that by the resurrection of our LORD a most manifest proof of our liberty hath shone upon us, we are not burthened by the heavy operation of those signs which we now understand; but our LORD Himself and Apostolical discipline hath delivered to us some few instead of many, and the same most easy to perform, most august to the understanding, and of most pure observance; as is the Sacrament of Baptism and the celebration of the Body and Blood of the LORD."<sup>a</sup> So also Paschasius Radbert, Abbat of Corbey, (A.D. 1111,) writing of the Eucharist, says: "CHRIST hath left to His Church nothing more in a mystery than this and the Sacrament of Baptism, and moreover the Holy Scriptures. In all which, the HOLY SPIRIT, Who is the pledge of the whole Church, inwardly works the mysteries of our salvation to immortality."<sup>b</sup> So Arnoldus De Bona Valle (A.D. 1162): "To the charity of CHRIST which hungers and thirsts after our righteousness the TRINITY beareth witness in heaven, the SON Himself who justifieth, the SPIRIT Who sanctifieth, the FATHER Who glorifieth; because both our righteousness and holiness and brightness is from above; and the testimony of GOD, which is greater than that of man, commends and informs and confirms these His gifts in us. Nevertheless on earth, that which is invisibly done within, is externally commended by visible and corporal Sacraments; the SPIRIT, the water, and the blood, bear witness to the Christian faith, which three are one, and remain undivided; and none of them is separated from its connection, because the Catholic Church lives and profits by this faith, so that now neither may the humanity be believed without the real Divinity, nor the Divinity without the humanity. Nor would the testimony from heaven, which the TRINITY beareth to Itself, suffice us towards understanding; unless the truth of the Faith became known to us also by some signs and proofs. There are then these three, the SPIRIT of sanctification, the blood of redemption, the water

<sup>a</sup> De Doctrina Christiana, Lib. iii. c. 9, Tom. III. p. 49.

<sup>b</sup> Paschasius, De Corpore et Sanguine Domini, c. 7. Ed. Colon. Agripp. 1550.

of purification. The Blood redeems those only whom grace calls and washes; nor doth the SPIRIT sanctify except those that are washed and dead to sin. They share alike redemption, and ablution, and sanctification. The one cannot be without the other; and that which is done is one, not manifold. For the HOLY SPIRIT is borne upon the Mysteries, is present to the Sacraments; the reason whereof the cleansing water signifies, which contains the sign of that to which both the Blood of CHRIST and the SPIRIT of GOD supplies effect. We are purified in the water, we are fashioned (*informamur*) in the Blood."<sup>1</sup> Rupert, Abbat of Duytz, is very express on the subject. He asks, "Which then and how many are the principal Sacraments of our salvation? Sacred Baptism, the Holy Eucharist of His Body and Blood, the twin gift of the HOLY GHOST; to wit, the one for the remission of sins, the other for the grant of manifold graces. These three Sacraments are the necessary instruments of our salvation."<sup>2</sup> And even Aquinas makes a distinction in their favour: "It is plain," he says, "that the Sacraments of the Church have their virtue specially from the Passion of CHRIST, which virtue is in some way joined to us by receiving of the Sacraments; in sign whereof water and blood flowed from the side of CHRIST hanging on the Cross, whereof the one pertains to Baptism, the other to the Eucharist, which are the chief Sacraments."<sup>3</sup>

§. 3. Something remains to be said of "those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction." While they all in some respects answer to the idea of a Mystery or Sacrament, they will yet be found to fail in corresponding with the full definition of the two great Sacraments of the Gospel, either in that they are not "generally necessary to salvation,"<sup>4</sup> or in "that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of GOD."<sup>5</sup> As to the mere name of Sacraments, there would be little difficulty in granting it in the

Of 'the five commonly called Sacraments.'

<sup>1</sup> Arnold. Abbas Bonæ-Vallis, De Verbis Domini in Cruce, c. 4; *ad calcem* Opp. S. Cypriani, p. 9, Ed. Fell.

<sup>2</sup> Rupertus Tuicensis, De Victoria Verbi Dei, Lib. xii. c. 11. Ed.

Norembergæ, 1525.

<sup>3</sup> "Quæ sunt potissima sacramenta." S. Tho. Summ. Pars iii. qu. 62, art. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Catechism.

<sup>5</sup> Article XXV.

sense of a sign of a sacred thing or subject ; for in that sense the ancient Church styled the salt given emblematically to Catechumens, their 'Sacrament.'<sup>n</sup> But, as not only do the Fathers style these sacred ordinances 'Sacraments,' but our great divine Thorndike allows them to be 'Sacraments of the Church,' we will proceed to examine their claims in detail.

And first, of Confirmation. The Bishops, "after the example of the holy Apostles," lay their hands on the persons to be confirmed "to certify them (by this sign) of God's favour and gracious goodness towards them."<sup>o</sup> Here we have an outward visible sign, the laying on of hands; and some inward spiritual grace, though the nature of it is not exactly specified. In the first instance of its employment, certainly, it was connected with the extraordinary gifts of the SPIRIT, such as speaking with strange tongues and prophesying; for we read that the exhibition of those gifts tempted the cupidity of Simon Magus; "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostles' hands the HOLY GHOST was given, he offered them money."<sup>p</sup> It was not the power of conferring an inward spiritual grace, which that bad man coveted, but the glory attending the exercise of visibly supernatural powers. Another passage makes this perfectly clear; "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the HOLY GHOST came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." And the gift of the HOLY GHOST implies the extraordinary powers in this connection, as is seen from the verse; "And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the HOLY GHOST. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God."<sup>r</sup> But, as Confirmation commenced in connection with Baptism in the time of the Apostles, so it was continued by their suc-

<sup>n</sup> "Item placuit, ut etiam per sollemnissimos paschales dies sacramentum catechumenis non detur, nisi solitum sal: quia si fideles per illos dies sacramentum non mutant, nec catechumenis oportet mutari." Conc. Carthag. III. Canon 5, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1167. See also S. Aug. De Catechizandis Rudibus,

c. 26; and De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. iv. c. 21, Tom. IX. p. 138; "aut catechumeni sacramentum sacramento baptismi præferendum putamus, etc."

<sup>o</sup> Order of Confirmation.

<sup>p</sup> Acts viii. 18.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* xix. 6.

<sup>r</sup> *Ib.* x. 45, 46.

cessors as an appendage and complement of that holy Sacrament. Thus, Tertullian interposes no interval of years between baptism, the chrism, and the imposition of hands. "Thence," he says, "having gone from the baptistery we are anointed with the blessed unction, from the ancient discipline whereby men were anointed priests with oil from a horn. Thus in us too the unction flows carnally, but it profits spiritually; since of Baptism itself also the carnal act is, our being dipped in water; the spiritual effect, our deliverance from transgressions. Then the hand is imposed, by benediction invoking and inviting the HOLY SPIRIT."\* S. Cyprian joins it with Baptism; "It is but little to lay hands on them (that is, reconciled heretics) towards receiving the HOLY GHOST, unless they also receive the Church's Baptism. For then at last can they be fully sanctified and be sons of GOD, if they be born of either sacrament."† And Augustine says; "By this ointment ye would understand the Sacrament of Chrism: which indeed in the nature of visible seals is holy, even as Baptism itself."‡

Secondly, of Penance it may be said, that with Confirmation it shares in the outward sign of the laying on of hands, and symbolizes the forgiveness of the sinner upon his hearty repentance and sincere conversion. It is ordained of CHRIST Himself, where He saith, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained;"§ and possibly witnessed to by S. Paul where he says, that GOD "hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."|| But then the words of CHRIST are large enough to cover generally every application and retention of Gospel privileges; nor can an ordinance, which depends so much on the state of discipline in a particular Church, be safely assumed to be "generally necessary to salvation," without some more express guarantee for the assertion. Bellarmine cites S. Ambrose; but *he* refers to the outward public Confession before the congregation, as practised in primitive

\* Tert. De Baptismo, c. 7, 8. p. 226.

† S. Cypr. Ep. 72. p. 196.

‡ "Quod quidem in genere visibilium signaculorum sacrosanctum

est, sicut ipse Baptismus." S. Aug. Contra litteras Petilian, Lib. ii. c. 104. Tom. IX. p. 293.

§ S. John xx. 23.

|| 2 Cor. v. 19.



times, as is evident from the following passage : " In Baptism to be sure there is remission of all sins ; what matters it, whether by Penance or by the Laver priests claim this right given to them ? There is one mystery in either. But you say that the grace of mysteries operates in the Laver. What in Penance ? Doth not GOD's Name operate ? What then ? Where ye will, ye claim GOD's grace for yourselves : where ye will, do ye repudiate it ? But this proceeds of insolent arrogance, not of holy fear ; so that they who would do penance disgust you. Ye cannot, ye see, endure the tears of those that weep. Your eyes bear not the vileness of their clothing, the filthy neglect of those that wear sordid apparel ; with haughty eye and swelling heart, my delicate ones, saying each of you with indignant voice, Touch me not, for I am clean." \* S. Augustine undoubtedly regarded Penance as in some sense a Sacrament : for he writes ; " If then what is said in the Gospel, ' GOD heareth not sinners,' † avails to this end, that Sacraments be not celebrated by a sinner ; how doth He hearken to a homicide praying, either over the water of Baptism, or over oil, or over the Eucharist, or over the heads of those on whom the hand is imposed ? All which however both are done and are valid too by means of homicides, that is, by those who hate their brethren, even in the Church herself inwardly.' ‡ As Penance is the healing of breaches in the covenant of Grace, it comes near to the universal character of Baptism and the Eucharist ; and Melancthon reckons it as a *third* great Sacrament of the Gospel. Yet the public solemnity is wanting to auricular Confession as well as the performance of penance.

Thirdly, the Sacrament of Order shares with the two great Sacraments in most of what enters into the definition of Sacraments. It has the outward visible sign of the laying on of hands, as is easily shown from the words of our Ordinal ;

\* S. Ambr. De Pœnitentia, Lib. i. c. 8. Opp. Tom. II. p. 400. Belarmino stops short at " Nonne Dei Nomen operatur ? " I continue the quotation to the end of the section in the Benedictine edition, to show that it properly refers to the public Exomolosis, not to private Auri-

cular Confession. Like Confirmation, this Penance is a kind of supplement to Baptism ; " Unum in utroque mysterium est."

† S. John ix. 31.

\* S. Aug. De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. v. c. 20. Tom. IX. p. 155.

where, as well in the consecration of Bishops as in the ordering of Priests, the officiating Prelate is made to say, "Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a Bishop (or Priest) in the Church of GOD, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands." It has likewise some inward spiritual grace, as our Form of Consecration of Bishops further hath it; "And remember that thou stir up the grace of GOD which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands." In the Form of Ordering of Priests this grace is described as being not personal to the individual or directly aiding his own salvation, but external and ministerial, and as enabling him to perform acts "to the edifying and making perfect CHRIST'S Church." "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of GOD, and of His holy Sacraments." These assertions have the authority of Scripture; "Neglect not," saith S. Paul, "the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."<sup>a</sup> "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of GOD, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands."<sup>b</sup> The Sacrament of Order was instituted by CHRIST Himself, as S. Paul again saith, "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of CHRIST. And He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of CHRIST."<sup>c</sup> And our Ordinal states concerning CHRIST: "Who, after that He had made perfect our Redemption by His death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down His gifts abundantly upon men, making some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Doctors, to the edifying and making perfect His Church." S. Augustine expressly terms Order a sacrament, ranking it even with Baptism itself. "No cause is shown, why he, who may not lose Baptism itself, may lose the right of conferring it. For both are sacraments; and both are given to a man by a certain

<sup>a</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 14.

<sup>b</sup> 2 Tim. i. 6.

<sup>c</sup> Eph. iv. 7, 11, 12.

consecration, the one when he is baptized, the other when he is ordained; and therefore in the Catholic Church it is not lawful to repeat either."<sup>d</sup> Yet doth not Order belong to Sacraments generally necessary to the salvation of the individual Christian and therefore requiring a general application.

Fourthly, Matrimony is a "state of life allowed in the Scriptures;"<sup>e</sup> "an honourable estate, instituted of GOD in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt CHRIST and His Church;" and "consecrated" by GOD "to such an excellent Mystery, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt CHRIST and His Church."<sup>f</sup> The Divine institution is clear: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh. What therefore GOD hath joined together, let not man put asunder."<sup>g</sup> But, as it represents that which is clearly external thereunto and independent, that is, the love of CHRIST towards his Church, "This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning CHRIST and the Church;"<sup>h</sup> not as though the "giving and receiving of a ring and joining of hands," ordained by Church authority, were a Divine means to assure the married persons of that "spiritual benediction and grace," which the Minister invokes upon them; Matrimony fails to establish any character beyond that of a sacred Ordinance, which from its Scriptural analogy to the mystery of CHRIST's love for his Church may itself in a sense be termed a Mystery or Sacrament. Thus Augustine: "But since of many souls there is to be one city (or state) of them that have one soul and one heart towards GOD; which perfection of unity is to be after this pilgrimage, where the thoughts of all shall neither be mutually hidden nor again repugnant: therefore the Sacrament of Marriage in our time

<sup>d</sup> S. Aug. *Contra Epist. Parmeniani*, Lib. ii. c. 13. Tom. IX. p. 44. Again; "Si enim utrumque sacramentum est, quod nemo dubitat; cur illud non amittitur, et illud amittitur? Neutri sacramento injuria facienda est." (*Ibid.* p. 45.) "Sacramentum enim baptismi est quod habet qui baptizatur; et sa-

cramentum dandi baptismi est quod habet qui ordinatur." (*De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, Lib. i. c. 1. Tom. IX. p. 80.

<sup>e</sup> Article XXV.

<sup>f</sup> Form of Solemnization of Matrimony.

<sup>g</sup> S. Matt. xix. 5, 6.

<sup>h</sup> Eph. v. 32.

hath been reduced to one husband and one wife, in such wise that it may not be lawful to ordain as a ruler of the Church except the husband of one wife."<sup>1</sup> He means one who has not contracted a *second* marriage.

Fifthly, the Unction of the sick, or, as it afterwards became, Extreme Unction, hath at least an outward form in common with Sacraments. "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the LORD."<sup>2</sup> And the grace of outward healing, typical (as in so many of our LORD'S miracles) of an inward remission of sins, is also annexed to it by Apostolic authority: "And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the LORD shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."<sup>3</sup> And we read of the Twelve Apostles; "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."<sup>4</sup> But in its original institution it was meant to convey an extraordinary gift of healing, as Confirmation did that of speaking with tongues: there is no trace of any notion of consecrating the body before its final dissolution, such as afterwards prevailed. Though the idea of Extreme Unction hath a touching resemblance to her work, of whom JESUS said, "For in that she hath poured this ointment on My Body, she did it for my burial."<sup>5</sup> But, while the change of Unction of the sick into Extreme Unction is termed "a corrupt following of the Apostles," it may excite surprise, that when Confirmation has been retained, notwithstanding the absence of those miracles which formerly accompanied it, Unction should have been omitted, because "the prayer of faith" no longer commonly avails to "save the sick." Thorndike maintains that the benefit is withheld because of 'the decay of Christianity in the Church;' (*Just Weights*, c. XVIII. §. 8.) and suggests Visiting the sick as a substitute. But Unction comprises visiting the sick; the absence of 'gifts

<sup>1</sup> De Bono Conjugali, c. 18; Tom. VI. p. 331. "Quod acutius intellexerunt, qui nec eum qui catechumenus vel paganus habuerit alteram, ordinandum esse censuerunt. De sacramento enim agitur, non de peccato." *Ibid.* See also

c. 24. De Fide et Operibus, c. 7, Tom. VI. p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> S. James v. 14.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> S. Mark vi. 13.

<sup>5</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 12.

<sup>6</sup> Acts xix. 6.

of healing' no more excuses the omission of Unction than that of the gift of tongues would justify the abolition of Confirmation. Unction of the sick has been practised in the Scottish episcopal Church. Perhaps the burlesque of Unction by the 'Peculiar People' may teach us the danger of abolishing ordinances. Instances of its being termed a Sacrament are rare. Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 416,) speaks thus of it. Quoting the passage of S. James, he adds; "Which there is no doubt should be understood of the faithful that are sick, who may be anointed with the holy oil of chrism; the which being made by a Bishop it is lawful not only for priests but *for all Christians* to use in anointing, in his own or his friend's necessity. A Bishop whose business it is to make it, may without delay both bless and touch with chrism. For it may not be poured on penitents, because it is *a kind of Sacrament*: since, to whom the other Sacraments are denied, how may one kind be thought to admit of being granted?"\* If all Christians may anoint, according to Innocent I., then is Unction not a Sacrament requiring the intervention of the Christian priesthood. If it be an appurtenance of Penance, as S. James suggests by coupling it with Absolution, then it follows not it should be abolished, because it no longer by outward healing betokens the corresponding cure of sins by confession. (Calvin. *Instit.* IV. xix. 18.)

The analogies discovered by the Schoolmen between the seven Sacraments and the principal acts of civil or social life rather serve as monuments of theological ingenuity than as traditions of Apostolical teaching. Thus Aquinas compares Baptism to the natural act of birth; Confirmation to that of growth; the Eucharist to nutrition; Penance to the cure of disease; Extreme Unction to the restoration of health by convenient diet and exercise. (But if Unction be at the *extremity* of life, how can it answer to the restoration of health?) Order to the power of public regimen; and Matrimony to the natural preservation of the human species.<sup>p</sup> Again, Durandus makes the Sacraments to correspond with the three theological and the four cardinal virtues. Thus:

\* Innocentii P.P. I. Epist. 1, c.  
8, *ap.* Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1248.

<sup>p</sup> Summæ iii. qu. 65, art. 1.

Baptism fits us for acts of faith ; Extreme Unction for hope ; the Eucharist for charity ; Confirmation for fortitude ; Penance for justice ; Order for prudence ; Matrimony for temperance.<sup>a</sup>

The term *Sacramentals*, which some of late apply to the five commonly called Sacraments, was employed by the Schools to designate another and yet inferior class of ordinances ; as Durandus writes : “ It follows from what has been said, that all such as have been instituted by the Church after CHRIST are not Sacraments but Sacramentals, as benedictions of Abbats, Abbesses, Virgins, vestments, and holy water, anointings of Kings, consecrations of altars, churches, vessels, and things of that sort ; in which, as the Church could institute, so can she leave off and dispense and change.”<sup>r</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Durand. in Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 2, qu. 2.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* qu. 1.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

## OF BAPTISM.

General  
necessity of  
Baptism.

§. 1. FULL of holy gratitude for "that inestimable benefit of the redemption of the world by the LORD JESUS CHRIST," the Primitive Church dwelt upon it with the innocent confidence of children, not with the critical air of philosophical investigators. They estimated "the means of grace" by that wealth of love, which was seen to be so affluent, that GOD gave His SON to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. They exulted in "the hope of glory," without forgetting that some would with the son of perdition be disappointed of that hope. They were not ignorant how that GOD hath chosen His Elect before the foundation of the world, having predestinated them unto the adoption of children by JESUS CHRIST to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will;<sup>a</sup> nor how that it necessarily follows that "therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth."<sup>b</sup> But who that hath caught a glimpse of the fulness and freedom of Divine grace can bear to divert his attention to the chilling abatement expressed in the words, "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not?"<sup>c</sup> He will rather dwell on the glorious contrast; "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of GOD, even to them that believe on His Name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of GOD."<sup>d</sup> And so the Church, looking to the salvation that welled out of the SAVIOUR'S side as He hung on the Cross, admitted not the suggestions of doubt, nor an-

<sup>a</sup> Eph. i. 4, 5.  
<sup>b</sup> Rom. ix. 18.

<sup>c</sup> S. John i. 11.  
<sup>d</sup> S. John i. 12, 13.

ticipated the final separation of the Judgment Day. The result is a summary and compendious language. Catholic divines do not stop at every stage of the marvellous provisions of Grace, to inquire how far that which is true in itself is true in combination. The fact that the Reprobate are at present intermingled with the Elect doth not nullify the fact that the Gospel is a covenant of free grace. Nor is the position that Baptism is the Sacrament of our Regeneration or new Birth in CHRIST overturned by the abatement, which experience compels us to make, that all its descriptions will not apply to all who are baptized. But as, in the case of secular education, we speak of it with reference to its scope and the intentions of its promoters and its tried successes; so, without denying that in many cases the Sacrament of Baptism has not invariably its "wholesome effect and operation," we may safely describe it as being that which its Divine Institutor intended it should be.

The Ancient Church spoke of it in terms, fresh and vigorous and buoyant as the purifying wave, which symbolizes its hidden virtue. It would seem as if no shade of sorrow dimmed the brightness of the picture. "The WORD was made flesh," says Tertullian, "to deliver His purity to the waters; thenceforward whatsoever flesh in CHRIST undoeth its remaining pristine uncleanness, it is now another thing; it now emerges new, not from the filth of concupiscence, but from pure water and a clean spirit."<sup>†</sup> So also Damascene: "Now therefore by Baptism we receive the first-fruits of the HOLY SPIRIT; and our regeneration becomes a principle of another life, and a seal, and protection, and enlightenment." But then he judiciously adds; "But we must needs with all our power keep ourselves clean from filthy deeds, lest, having turned like the dog to his own vomit again, we should again make ourselves slaves to sin. For faith without works is dead, as also works without faith; since true faith is tested by works."<sup>\*</sup> Lancelotti gives the very pith of ancient theology in a few words: "Baptism is an outward washing of the body, which, with the aid of a certain form of words,

<sup>†</sup> Tert. De Pudicitia, cap. 6, p. 559.

<sup>\*</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. cap. 86.



designates and works an inward ablution of the soul. For as circumcision in the people of God, instituted for a seal of faith and righteousness, availed to infants to mark the purgation of original sin; so also Baptism *begins* to avail to the renewing of man. Nor yet from the moment a man is baptized, is all the old infirmity forthwith consumed in him, but his renewing begins to the remission of sins and to the understanding and operation of spiritual things. But the rest is in hope, until it be in deed accomplished, which will be at the resurrection. Although full remission of sins takes place in Baptism, there doth not therefore ensue complete newness and change.”<sup>†</sup>

Proofs of its  
importance.

§. 2. Among the many proofs, which may be brought forward of the importance which the Church has ever attached to the Sacrament of Baptism, the argument derived from the universal custom of baptizing infants may be set in the foremost rank. S. Augustine appeals to it again and again. S. Fulgentius and his brother-Bishops affirm, that “it is to be maintained, that the souls of infants are bound by the bond of original sin; and that the Sacrament of holy Baptism is necessary to all, whereby the bond of original sin is remitted, and the adoption of sons lost in the first man is recovered by means of the second Man.”<sup>\*</sup> If, when Calvin speaks of the infants of the faithful having an *hereditary right* to the covenant of Grace, as followed by the Directory, he meant irrespectively of baptism, he forgot that Adam was the common Father of elect as well as reprobate, and that the latter inherit not the promise of eternal life. The argument proves too much. The Directory saith “right to the seale of the Covenant,” that is, Baptism. So that it regards Calvin’s argument as a mere plea to enforce Infant Baptism. (*Thorndike*, Vol. IV. Pt. I. pp. 157–159.) Calvin borrowed his notion from Tertullian’s “*ex seminis prærogativâ*,” (*De Animâ*, c. 39.) yet Tertullian limits the *designatos sanctitati* to the baptized.

Secondly, the importance of Baptism is shown by the practice of the Church in allowing Lay persons to baptize in

<sup>†</sup> Lancelotti Instt. Juris Canon. Lib. ii. Tit. 3.

<sup>\*</sup> Episcopop. Africanorum Epist. Synod. c. 25, *ap.* Labbe. Tom IV. p. 1599.

cases of necessity, when the lawful minister may not conveniently be procured. Thus Tertullian writes: "The chief Priest, who is the Bishop, hath indeed the right of conferring it; next, Presbyters and Deacons, not however without the Bishop's authority, because of the honour of the Church; which being safe, peace is preserved. Otherwise even laymen have the right; for what is received equally may be equally bestowed; unless now (it be) Bishops or Presbyters or Deacons (that are) called Disciples. The Word of the LORD ought not to be hidden from any one. Consequently Baptism also, being equally GOD's property, may be exercised by all. But how much more is the discipline of reserve and modesty incumbent on laymen, when those functions are competent to their superiors, that they assume not to themselves the office of the Episcopate. Emulation is the mother of schisms. The holy Apostle hath said, all things are lawful, but all things are not expedient. Let it suffice, to wit, that you use the licence in necessities, as the condition of either place or time or person compels. For then is the presence of mind of the succourer accepted, when the circumstance of danger is urgent." <sup>a</sup> The Council of Elvira supplies a convenient commentary in a canon, which ordains that in cases of necessity, such as of persons at sea or if a church be not at hand, one of the faithful, provided his own baptism be correct, and (according to the strictness of the then discipline) he be not a *bigamus* or twice married, may baptize; provided moreover, that, if the person baptized survive, his baptizer should bring him to the Bishop, to be perfected by the imposition of hands. <sup>b</sup>

Thirdly, it is shown by the Church's accepting even the Baptism conferred by heretics, provided the form of the Church was employed, *and the orthodox faith in the TRINITY professed*. For in such a case a heretic on returning to orthodox communion was received with the imposition of hands or the ceremony of unction. <sup>c</sup> Augustine repeatedly affirms

<sup>a</sup> De Baptismo, c. 17. p. 231.

<sup>b</sup> Conc. Illiberritani Canon 38, ap. Labbe. Tom. I. p. 1248. Vid. S. Aug. Contra Epist. Parmeniani,

Lib. ii. c. 13. Tom. IX. p. 44.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodoxos, apud S. Justini M. Opp. p. 399.

that a General Council, supposed to be that of Nice, had confirmed this practice, which was so strenuously opposed by S. Cyprian and his perverse imitators, the Donatists of later times.<sup>d</sup> Note carefully, that the Church never declared the reason of allowing the baptism of heretics to be simply, "because they were baptized with the due form of words." (Thornd. *Just Weights*, c. XIV. §. 2.) The Nicene canons distinguish between schismatics (such as the Meletians) and heretics who deny fundamental truths of Christianity (such as the Paulianists). So that Aquinas, when he would allow Jews or Pagans to baptize, yet in the form of the Church, is opposed to the synod of Nicæa. Nor will the authority of Pope Nicholas I. avail in this case. (*Summæ* iii. Part. qu. 67. art. 5.)

Fourthly, it is shown by the questions raised about the *status* of persons who had been ordained without having previously received Baptism. Such a case is affirmed, (but on dubious authority),\* to have taken place in the consecration of Xenaias or Philoxenus as Bishop of Hierapolis in Syria by Peter Cnaphæus Patriarch of Antioch, who decided that his Orders sufficed for Baptism. But it was afterwards determined that such a person should be baptized and re-ordained: "and deservedly," remarks Lancelotti; "for, since Baptism is the gate and foundation of all Sacraments, nothing could be built on, where the foundation was wanting."<sup>f</sup> If the example of the Apostles be objected, concerning whom we do not read that they themselves were baptized, it may be enough to remark, that, when JESUS washed Peter's feet, He said, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me;" and added, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit."<sup>g</sup>

Fifthly, it is shown by the error of some ancient Christians in practising vicarious Baptism on behalf of those who were intercepted by death from being baptized: as S. Paul saith, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the

<sup>d</sup> Vid. S. Aug. Tom. IX. pp. 125, 126, 128, 155, 156, 161, 162, 169, 181, 185, 193, 195.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Nicephori Callistj Hist. Eccles. Lib. xvi. c. 27.

<sup>f</sup> Institt. Juris Canon. Lib. i. tit. 24.

<sup>g</sup> S. John xiii. 8, 10.—Vid. S. Optatus, Lib. v. p. 85.

dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?"<sup>b</sup> He does not pause to approve or condemn the practice; but argues from an extreme exaggeration of the necessity of baptism, that the case turns on the fact of the resurrection. The literal rendering 'on behalf of the persons deceased' leaves no reasonable doubt that S. Paul adverts to a fact in his time. And when infants were baptized in consideration of the faith of the Church expressed by their sponsors, some might without an heretical intent, yet superstitiously, extend the principle to the case of deceased catechumens.

Sixthly, it is shown by certain extreme cases in which Baptism was held efficacious. "For it is found in the Life of S. Athanasius, that certain children having been baptized by the Saint on the sand by the seaside by way of sport, (himself too being then a child), the Bishop of the place received them, and having anointed them with ointment as being already baptized dismissed them. And it is reported also in the Life of S. Porphyrius, that he was not baptized by an orthodox man, but being engaged on the stage he was drenched with water by an actor who was a heretic, as if he were perchance baptized; and the heretics that stood by took the transaction for an occasion of merriment, but he of martyrdom; for he saw Angels going before him with lamps, and crying aloud, 'As many of you as have been baptized into CHRIST have put on CHRIST;'<sup>c</sup> and thenceforth from being an actor he became a martyr."<sup>d</sup> Of such cases Augustine says; "But where there was no society of orthodox believers, and he that received (Baptism) believed not, but the whole were done in the way of mimicry and jest; as to whether the Baptism so given were to be approved of, I should deem that the Divine judgment was to be implored by concordant prayer and suppliant devotion; and would wait for others to produce some already ascertained instance."<sup>e</sup> And of another cognate question, Whether Baptism may be given by those who have never been Christians? he says, that "nothing

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 29.

<sup>c</sup> Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>d</sup> Balsamon, *ubi supra*, p. 506.

<sup>e</sup> S. Aug. De Baptismo cont. Donatistas, Lib. vii. c. 53. Tom. IX. p. 202.

is to be on that side affirmed without authority of as great a Council as is sufficient for so great a subject."<sup>1</sup>

Seventhly, it is shown by the witness borne to the sacred character impressed in baptism by the more reverent care bestowed on the burial of those, whose bodies have been therein consecrated to be temples of the HOLY GHOST. Perhaps the Eastern Church exhibits this most clearly. As Balsamon observes, "We do not at present celebrate the memorial of the departed in the way of mourning but of festivity and panegyric; giving thanks to God, Who hath been pleased to let the deceased depart in the orthodox faith, and hath let us bury openly and in all security those that have gone away from us and not stow them away privily as carcases, even as it was heretofore. Wherefore also we attend the departed on his way splendidly with lamps and ornaments, as one that hath been sanctified by holy Baptism."<sup>2</sup>

Lastly, we are taught the necessity of Baptism by the profusion of types, which in the Old Testament prefigured its institution. We have S. Paul teaching us to regard the passage of Israel through the Red Sea as typical of Baptism; "that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."<sup>3</sup> And S. Peter teaches the same of the ark; "the like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us."<sup>4</sup> The catalogue might easily be extended; but it is enough to say with S. Basil; "God, sparing our weakness, in the depth of the wealth of His wisdom, and in the untraceable judgments of His understanding, showed us this easy and well-arranged introduction; accustoming us first to see the shadows of the substances, and to behold the sun in the waters, so as not to have our sight darkened by instantly meeting the vision of the pure light. For by equal reason both the Law, having a shadow of the things to come, and the delineation by the Prophets, being an enigma of the truth, were devised as means to exercise the eyes of our

<sup>1</sup> S. Aug. *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*. Lib. ii. Tom. IX. p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Balsam. *ap.* Bevereg. T. i. p. 640.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.

<sup>4</sup> 1 S. Peter iii. 21.

heart; so that our passage from these might be easy to the wisdom hidden in mystery." <sup>p</sup>

§. 3. The reason for baptizing Infants is weakened by modern circumstances and the loss of discipline. Confirmation *early* administered witnesses to "the answer of a good conscience." (1 *Peter* iii. 21.) Ludovicus Vives upon S. Augustine (*De Civit. Dei*, I. 27), "gives very great reasons, why it were better, that the baptism of infants were deferred till they come to the discretion of understanding to what they engage themselves." (*Thornd.* IV. Pt. I. p. 165). One might infer from S. Gregory Nazianzen, (*Orat. xl. in S. Bapt.*), that infant baptism was not practised save in peril of death. The *practical* West made a rule of what was only expedient. Thorndike, against S. Augustine, attributes the rule of baptizing infants, *not* to Apostolic tradition, but "to the original power of the Church in determining circumstances." (*Ibid.* pp. 168, 172.)

Infant  
Baptism, a  
point of  
Church  
discipline.

§. 4. Without entering on minuter points in connection with Baptism, it can hardly be unnecessary to notice the question, Whether it should be administered by immersion or by sprinkling? Here Aquinas decides cautiously and with a leaning to common usage. "Water," he says, "is assumed in the Sacrament of Baptism to the purpose of bodily ablution, whereby is signified the inward washing away of sins. But ablution may be done with water, not only by means of immersion, but also by means of sprinkling or pouring. And therefore although it be safer to baptize by means of immersion, (because this is the more common usage,) yet Baptism may be performed by means of sprinkling, or even by pouring, according to that of Ezekiel, 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean;' <sup>q</sup> as blessed Laurence is said to have baptized; and this chiefly because of necessity, or because the number of persons to be baptized is great, as it is clear from the Acts, where it is said, 'Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.' <sup>r</sup>

Baptism by  
Immersion  
or by affu-  
sion.

<sup>p</sup> S. Basil. De S. Spiritu, c. 14.  
Opp. Tom. II. p. 175. Vid. Ter-  
tullian. De Baptismo, c. 9, p. 227.

<sup>q</sup> Ezekiel xxxvi. 25.  
<sup>r</sup> Acts ii. 41.—S. Tho. Summ.  
Part. iii. qu. 66. art. 7.

The same is the sentiment of Durandus. "It is more fittingly performed by immersion, and by trine rather than simple immersion;" the reason being, that, as in Baptism we are conformed to the burial of CHRIST, "buried with Him in baptism,"\* the being thrice dipped in the water more nearly represents His three days' sepulture. "In these matters however," he observes, "the custom of the Church is to be observed: for the Canons, which enjoin trine immersion, look not to that which is of the necessity of the Sacrament, but that which is of local custom or of the fitness of external representation."†

In illustration of the baptismal rites, Mabillon mentions a painting of the life of S. Laurence in the Basilica of S. Lorenzo at Rome, and the baptism of S. Romanus by him. With his right hand he blesses Romanus, who is naked, as having been immersed; with the left he pours a pitcher full of water on his head. The pouring of water was had recourse to, because his head could not be dipped; the immersion was applied to the rest of the body, that no part of the man should go without the sacred laver. In the MS. Acts of S. Gratianus, Felicissima, instructed by him in the mysteries of the Christian religion, is said to have offered him '*urceum cum aqua*,' 'a pitcher with water,' that she might be baptized. At this day too the Greeks themselves, besides trine immersion, also pour water on the heads of persons to be baptized; no doubt from ancient rite.‡

\* Col. ii. 12; Rom. vi. 3, 4.

† Mabillon. *Iter Italicum*, Mus.

‡ Durand. in *Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 3*, qu. 4. Ital. Tom. I. p. 81.

## CHAPTER XXV.

## OF CONFIRMATION.

§. 1. IMMEDIATELY after Baptism there followed in the Primitive Church the rite of Confirmation or the Laying on of hands by the Bishop on the person baptized. This was done in imitation of the Apostles in the Acts,\* as we have S. Cyprian's direct testimony; "And this is now also transacted with us, that they who are baptized in the Church are offered to the Heads of the Church, and by our prayer and imposition of hands obtain the HOLY GHOST, and are consummated with the seal of the LORD."† If we ask for a further reason for its administration by Bishops only, S. Jerome replies; "Learn that this observance descends from that authority, namely, that after the LORD'S Ascension the HOLY SPIRIT came down on the Apostles. And in many places we find the same thing usual, with a view to the honour of the Priesthood rather than to the necessity of law. The good estate of the Church depends on the dignity of the Chief Priest; to whom if some peculiar and eminent power were not given, as many schisms would be effected in the churches as there be priests. Thence came it, that without chrism and the Bishop's command neither Presbyter nor Deacon have the right of baptizing; which we know to be frequently allowed even to laymen, if however necessity compels."‡

Confirmation administered by Bishops.

\* Acts viii. 17; xix. 6.

† S. Cyp. Ep. 73, Opp. p. 202.

‡ S. Hieron. adv. Luciferianos, c. 4. Opp. Tom. II. p. 199.—The Greek Church maintains that the administration of Confirmation may be committed to Presbyters, with the addition of Chrism consecrated by a

Bishop. This *sine qua non* carries with it a tacit acknowledgment, that in such a case the Presbyter acts by virtue of a special delegation from the Bishop. Herein Aquinas (Summ. iii. Part. qu. 72. art. 11. ad 1<sup>am</sup>) and Scotus (in Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 7. qu. 1. §. 8.) agree, as far as



Its relation  
to Baptism.

§. 2. But, in order more clearly to understand its relation to Baptism, it must be borne in mind that Baptism was in the early Church administered only or chiefly at the seasons of Easter and Pentecost ;<sup>7</sup> and even then, "not without the Bishop's authority ;"<sup>8</sup> that in close succession followed the imposition of the Bishop's hands on the baptized, and his signing their foreheads with the sign of the cross by means of chrism ; and, lastly, his admitting them to partake of the Eucharist. Of course if adults or infants were baptized in case of necessity, the Confirmation and first Communion ensued at separate intervals of time and place. But that the three acts were commonly blended in one continuous ceremonial may be inferred from S. Optatus' comparison of the circumstances of our LORD'S Baptism in Jordan with the ritual practised by the Church. His words are these : "He descended into the water, not for that there was aught to be cleansed in God ; but water had needs go before the oil that was to come, to initiate and ordain and fulfil the mysteries of Baptism. While He was held washed in John's hands, the order of the mystery followed ; and the FATHER fulfilled what the SON had asked and what the HOLY SPIRIT had announced. The heaven was opened, while GOD the FATHER anointed ; the spiritual oil forthwith descended in the image of a dove, and settled on His head, and bedewed Him ; whence He began to be called CHRIST, when He was anointed by GOD the FATHER. And lest the laying on of hands should seem to have been wanting to Him, the voice of GOD was heard from the cloud, saying, 'This is My beloved SON, in Whom I am well pleased.'"<sup>9</sup>

When the Faith spread to villages and hamlets, this order necessarily could no longer be kept up. But in the great cities of Italy it was customary down to a late period to reserve the celebration of Baptism for the baptisteries attached

the principle of delegacy is involved ; except that they confine the power of delegating to the Supreme Pontiff. On the other hand, Durandus (in Sent. L. iv. Dist. 7. qu. 3) and S. Bonaventure (in Sent. L. iv. Dist. 7. qu. 3,) maintain, that no commis-

sion of a superior authority can authorize the conferring of Confirmation by a simple Presbyter.

<sup>7</sup> Tert. De Baptismo, c. 19.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* c. 17.

<sup>9</sup> S. Matt. iii. 17.—S. Opt. Milev. Lib. iv. p. 81.

to the cathedral church.<sup>b</sup> And we have a most clear proof of the consecutive succession of the three rites on the same day, in a rubric of the Sacramentary of S. Gregory the Great on Easter Eve, when Baptism was most solemnly administered. The words are ; “And they are baptized ; and they who are to take them up from the font are ready with towels in their hands, and receive them from the Presbyters who baptize them : but the Pontiff returns to the *sacrarium*, waiting, until the infants have been dressed, to confirm them. Who also are not forbidden to have milk, if need be, before the Holy Communion. But when dressed they are arranged in order, as they are inscribed. And they hold infants indeed on the right arm ; but adults place their foot on the foot of their godfather.”<sup>c</sup> S. Augustine, in one passage, seems to connect chrism with Baptism ;<sup>d</sup> and Zonaras distinctly calls it ‘ a part of Baptism.’<sup>e</sup>

§. 3. *Chrism* has been already frequently mentioned as identical in primitive times with the rite of Confirmation. Our ancestors called it ‘ the holy cream,’ and the unction ‘ an-nealing.’ It was composed of pure olive oil, the emblem of spiritual grace, and of balsam, as an additional evidence of fragrance and incorruption.<sup>f</sup> We trace its name as early as the Council of Laodiceæ, A.D. 367 ; which decrees, “that they that are illuminated ought after baptism to be anointed with the heavenly chrism and be partakers of the kingdom of God.”<sup>g</sup> “Although,” writes Estius, “we have no express mention of chrism in Holy Scripture ; yet some, among whom is

Of the use  
of Chrism.

<sup>b</sup> Mabillon mentions that at Novara, “as at Rome, Florence, Pisa, Parma, Padua, and in some other places ; where, besides at Rome, infants are dipped in the sacred laver in the baptisteries of the cathedral church only. Certainly of old Baptism was not celebrated except at the Bishop’s order, as Ignatius is witness in his Epistle to the Smyrnæans. (c. 8.) Whence the baptistery was in that church only, where the Bishop s. te.” (*Iter Italic.* p. 10.)

<sup>c</sup> S. Greg. Magni Opp. Tom. V. p. 111.

<sup>d</sup> “Quomodo aquam mundat et sanctineat homicida ? Quomodo benedicunt oleum tenebræ ?” De Baptismo c. Donatistas, Lib. v. c. 20, Tom. IX. p. 154.

<sup>e</sup> Τελείως μὲν οὖν βαπτίζειν τοὺς ἤδη βαπτισθέντας ἀπηγόρευται πάντῃ, μὴρπ δὲ χρίειν αὐτοὺς μολυνθέντας ἔξεστιν εἰ καὶ τοῦτο μέρος δοκεῖ τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος. Zonar. in Canon. 47 SS. Apostt: ap. Beveregii Synodic. Tom. I. p. 31.

<sup>f</sup> Durand. in Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 7, qu. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Canon. 48, ap. Bevereg. Synodic. Tom. I. p. 475.

Rabanus,<sup>b</sup> have thought not without reason, that the Apostle John alluded to it, when, fortifying and instructing the faithful against the wiliness of heretics, he says, 'But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.'<sup>1</sup> And again; 'But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things.'<sup>1</sup> In which places it is in Greek *χρῖσμα*, whereby the Apostle seems to have meant to signify the HOLY GHOST; to wit, looking to the rite of the Church, whereby under visible anointing the HOLY GHOST was given. Whence Augustine saith; 'The HOLY GHOST Himself is the spiritual anointing, the Sacrament whereof is in visible unction.'<sup>k</sup> A like allusion seems to be in the Apostle Paul<sup>1</sup> in these words; 'Now He which stablisheth us with you in CHRIST, and hath anointed us, is GOD; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the SPIRIT in our hearts.'<sup>m</sup> It was used to designate three things: first, that the Christian was thereby made partaker of the priestly and royal dignity;<sup>n</sup> secondly, that he became a wrestler against the devil;<sup>o</sup> thirdly, in remembrance of our SAVIOUR'S unction for His burial, for participation in His sufferings and His glory.<sup>p</sup> Tertullian enumerates the processes of sacramental acts much in the same way as above. "The flesh is washed, that the soul may be purified. The flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated. The flesh is sealed, that the soul too may be protected. The flesh is overshadowed by the laying on of the hand, that the soul also may be illuminated by the SPIRIT. The flesh feeds on the Body and Blood of CHRIST, that the soul also may be fed of GOD."<sup>q</sup> Some have maintained that Chrism at all times accompanied the laying on of hands in Confirmation, and that the unction in Baptism was always distinct. On the other

<sup>b</sup> De Institutione Clericorum, L. i. c. 27.

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. John ii. 20.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* v. 27.

<sup>k</sup> S. Aug. in Ep. Johan. c. 3, Tract. 3; Tom III. p. 845.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

<sup>m</sup> Estius, in Sent. Lib. iv. Dist.

7. Opp. Tom. IV. p. 87.

<sup>n</sup> 1 S. Pet. ii. 9.

<sup>o</sup> Eph. vi. 12—Prosperi Aquitani Lib. Sent. §. 344, in Append. S. Aug. Tom. X. p. 247.

<sup>p</sup> Quæstt. et Respons. ad Orthodoxos, qu. 137, ap. S. Justin Mart. Opp. p. 487.

<sup>q</sup> Tert. De Resurrectione Carnis, c. 8, p. 330.

hand others asserted, that the use of Chrism came in by reason of Confirmation's almost immediately following Baptism in the primitive times; that, when Confirmation came to be deferred in point of time, unction was used as a remnant of the former; so that there came to be two distinct anointings, the unction on the head of the recipient by the Priest in Baptism, and the chrism on the forehead by the Bishop in Confirmation.\*

§. 4. We are met with considerable difficulty, when we inquire about the purport and object of Confirmation. And it is a suspicious circumstance, that, in examining the portion of the Canon Law devoted to this subject, we find the authorities alleged out of the false Decretal Epistles and Councils too late and local to enable us to assume them as specimens of a fair induction. But the theory generally followed is that of Aquinas; which proceeds on the ground of analogy between the physical and spiritual life of man, and the difference that there is between birth and growth. "As a man then receives spiritual life by Baptism, which is spiritual regeneration, so in Confirmation he receives a certain perfect age of spiritual life."† But that this could not have been the original theory of Confirmation is shown, I conceive, by the important Rubric already quoted from S. Gregory's Sacramentary; which proves that Baptism and Confirmation were administered to infants on the same day. But birth and growth to a perfect age could not conveniently be symbolized as coincident. And therefore the rite naturally came to be deferred, until persons were come to years of discretion. Another theory implies, that it was ordained to meet the special spiritual difficulty of confessing the Faith in time of persecution.‡ But, beside the fact of the absence of all Scriptural grounds in its favour, the administration of Confirmation in times of peace and also to infants tells against this

The object  
of Confirma-  
tion.

\* Jacobi Sirmondi S. J. *Antirrheticus ii. adversus Petrum Aurelium*, Opp. Tom. IV. p. 298, Ed. Paris, 1696. It may be noticed, that in S. Gregory's Sacramentary (p. 111) Chrism is twice employed; while the Questions and Answers to the

Orthodox distinguish between the *ἐλαϊον* and *μύρον*.

† S. Tho. Summ. Part iii. qu. 72, art. 1.

‡ Durand. in Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 7, qu. 1.

theory. A third maintains, that, "as by Baptism a person participates in spiritual things, and the soul is disposed to the more easily receiving grace; in Confirmation he is made stronger, and grace is infused against the snares of the devil. For when a man fights daily among invisible enemies by Confirmation the spiritual combatant is strengthened against the efforts of the devil. Whence he who is confirmed is stronger to resist the wiles of the devil than he who is only baptized. For the HOLY GHOST is conferred, Whom the Apostles formerly conferred by the imposition of hands only." \* This view is taken by the Epitomator of the Canon Law, who says that "the HOLY GHOST herein supplies strength and increase to grace." † And it seems in accordance with our Order of Confirmation, where the Bishop prays that GOD may 'strengthen' the confirmed "with the HOLY GHOST, and daily increase in them His manifold gifts of grace." ‡ Is this generally true? If only in exceptional cases, the statement lies not to the purpose of Dogma. The sacrament of Confirmation may by some be entitled 'the seal of the LORD.' If they mean thereby the instrument conferring a *special* grace, where is the proof? If they mean the solemn ratification of their engagement in the baptismal covenant, *when infants*, (the common Anglican theory,) then is it most correctly called the Sealing of the covenant and the Confirmation of baptismal vows, though the significant unction by the bishop be unwisely omitted, and the distinct theory now set forth be not found expressed earlier than in the ninth century by Agobard archbishop of Lyons. On an obscure subject I prefer the judgment of Thorndike, that Confirmation is an act, whereby the bishop as chief pastor acknowledges the baptized for part of his flock, in token of the unity of the Church; and the baptized renews the covenant of baptism, as internally, so also in regard to the Church. The theories already noticed are but scholastic deductions from the vague rhetoric of earlier writers. (See *Thornd.* IV. Pt. I. pp. 372, 468.)

\* Panormitan. in I. Part. I. Decret. tit. De Consuetudine, c. 4.

† Lancelotti Instt. Juris Canon.

Lib. ii. tit. iv. §. 2.

‡ See also S. Gregory's Sacramentary, *ubi supra*.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

§. 1. WE come now to the consideration of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist or Supper of the LORD. And, as it is almost beyond any other doctrine mixed up with controversial and conflicting statements, I will endeavour to confine myself as much as possible to what the Fathers of the undivided Church have gathered out of Scripture concerning it. The name usually given to it in the Primitive Church was EUCHARIST, that is, *the thanksgiving*, by way of excellence; for in commemorating the Death of CHRIST all was summed up in that stupendous mercy. Immediately, the name was borrowed from the Anaphora or Consecration Prayer, in which all God's mercies to His people were particularly rehearsed. Thus S. Justin writes: "Then bread and a cup of wine and water is offered to the president of the brethren. And he, having taken it, sends up praise and glory to the FATHER or all, through the Name of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST; and makes thanksgiving at great length for that we are vouchsafed these things. And this food is called with us Eucharist, whereof no one is allowed to partake but he that believes what is taught by us to be true, and has been washed with the baptism for remission of sins and regeneration, and so lives as CHRIST has enjoined."\* And Origen says; "The Bread called Eucharist is a symbol of our thanksgiving towards God."† The second name, which is customary with us, is that of the *Holy Communion*. Instances of it are comparatively rare in Antiquity; probably because it denotes a part

Of the terms  
'Eucharist,'  
'Communion,' 'Supper of the Lord.'

\* S. Justini M. Opp. p. 97.

† Orig. cont. Cels., Lib. viii. p. 428.

of the sacred action, and not the whole.\* The third name, which finds peculiar acceptance among moderns, is that of the *Supper of the Lord*. It is recommended by the fact of its being Scriptural. But the Scripture-use of the term will be found to prove too much. For it embraces (in S. Paul's use of it) the ordinance of the *Agape* or love-feast as well as the mysterious Sacrament of CHRIST'S Presence; as any candid person will feel on examining S. Paul's words. "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the LORD'S Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken."† And when the *Agape* had been disused, it was still usual to retain a shadow of it in the peculiar observance of Maundy Thursday, the evening of the Last Supper. The Third Council of Carthage refers to some observance of the sort where it says, "that the Sacraments of the altar be not celebrated by men except fasting, save on the one anniversary day, whereon the Supper of the LORD is celebrated."‡ S. Augustine employs the term, as, where he says; "Why then do ye not only take the food of your table with such persons against the Apostle's precept, but also communicate the Supper of the LORD'S Table?"§

Reason of  
the institu-  
tion of the  
Eucharist.

§. 2. To expound the reason of the institution of the Eucharist "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, and of the benefits which we receive thereby," I can find no words more suitable than those of Damascene. "By His Birth or Incarnation," he says, "by His Baptism, and Passion, and Resurrection, He delivered our nature from the sin of our forefather, from death and

\* Thus, in the Council of Illiberis A.D. 305, Can. iii. "Placuit ulterius eis non esse dandam communionem, ne lusisse de Dominica communione videantur." (ap. Labbe. Tom. I. p. 1101.) Fernando Mendoza thus interprets the words; though Albaspinæus will have them to refer to the right of communion or fellowship among Christians, which yet is symbolized by our partaking of that 'one bread.' "For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one

bread." (1 Cor. x. 17.)

† 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21.

‡ Conc. Carth. III. Can. 29, ap. Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1171.

§ S. Aug. Contra Epist. Parmeniani, Lib. iii. c. 2. Tom. IX. p. 60. Cardinal Bona recounts the names given to the whole Eucharistic action, as Collecta, Dominicum, Agenda, Communio, Oblatio, Liturgia, Mystagogia, Synaxis, Telete, Anaphora, Prophora, Œconomia. (Rerum Liturgicarum Lib. i. c. 3, Opp. p. 334.)

corruption, and became the firstfruits of the resurrection; and set Himself as a pattern, that we also following His steps may become by adoption, what He is by nature, sons and heirs of GOD and joint heirs with Him. He gave us then a second birth; that, as being born of Adam we were made like unto him, having inherited his curse and corruption; so also being born of Him we should be made like unto Him, and inherit His immortality and blessing. But since this Adam is spiritual, His birth must needs be spiritual, and in like manner His meat. Again, since we are double and composite, our birth must needs be double also, as likewise our meat composite. Our birth then was given us by water and the SPIRIT, I mean by holy Baptism; but our meat is the Bread of Life Himself, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Who came down from heaven. For, when He was about to undergo death voluntarily for us, in the night when He surrendered Himself, He disposed a New Testament to His holy apostles, and by them to all that believe in Him. Having then eaten the old passover with His disciples in the upper chamber of the holy and glorious Sion, and having fulfilled the Old Testament, He washed their feet, supplying a symbol of holy Baptism. Then having broken bread, He gave to them, saying, 'Take, eat; this is My Body, which is broken for you'<sup>d</sup> 'for remission of sins.'<sup>e</sup> And in like manner having also taken the cup of wine and water, He gave to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it; this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed' 'for you'<sup>f</sup> 'for the remission of sins.'<sup>g</sup> 'Do this in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the LORD's death' and confess His resurrection, 'till He come.'<sup>h</sup> The commemorative character of the Eucharist is further established by S. Justin Martyr; who speaks of "the bread of the Eucharist, which, in remembrance of the passion which He suffered for the men whose souls are purified from all wickedness, our LORD JESUS CHRIST commanded us to offer (*ποιεῖν*); that we might at the same time give GOD thanks

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 24.

<sup>e</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 28.

<sup>f</sup> S. Luke xxii. 20.

<sup>g</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 27, 28.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26.—S. Jo. Damasc. De Orthod. Fide, c. 90.



for that He created the world with all that is in it for man's sake, and for that He hath delivered us from the evil wherein we were born, and hath undone principalities and powers with a perfect undoing through Him Who became passible according to His will.'<sup>1</sup> Again: 'This only have Christians received commandment to offer, in remembrance of their food dry and liquid, wherein also commemoration is made of the passion which GOD suffered.'<sup>2</sup> If we ask why our LORD chose bread and wine to symbolize His Presence, Damascene answers, "GOD knoweth man's infirmity. With His wonted condescension He doeth what is supernatural by means familiar to nature. And as in the case of Baptism, since men are wont to wash with water and anoint themselves with oil, He linked the grace of the SPIRIT with oil and water, and made it a laver of regeneration; so, inasmuch as men are wont to eat bread and drink wine and water, He joined with them His own Divinity, and made them His Body and Blood, that by means of what is familiar and natural we might arrive at what is supernatural."<sup>3</sup>

Of the  
anti/typal  
Mysteries.

§. 3. A Sacrament consisting of two parts, the outward visible sign, *sacramentum*, or thing signifying, and the inward spiritual grace, *res sacramenti*, or thing signified, the Church has ever designated the Eucharist as *antitypal Mysteries*, that is to say, Mysteries which really and supernaturally become means of representing and conveying something heavenly that answers to and corresponds with the signifying symbols. And the representation is not merely vicarious, but in the original meaning of the term a rendering present of that which is not obvious. Or better perhaps, a payment in ready money of a portion of the sum promised. Thus, while the outward part of the Eucharist is "Bread and Wine, which the LORD hath commanded to be received;" the inward part is "the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the LORD's Supper." In illustration whereof S. Irenæus, writing against the Gnostics, says: "But how shall it be proved to them, that that Bread whereupon thanks have been offered is the

<sup>1</sup> S. Justin. Martyr. Dialog. cum Tryphone, Opp. p. 259.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 345.

<sup>3</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. *ubi supra*.

Body of their LORD, and the Cup that of His Blood, if they say not that He is the SON of the Maker of the world, that is, His Word, whereby the tree is fruitful, and fountains flow, and the earth gives first the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear? And how again say they that the flesh turns into corruption and receives not life, which is nourished by the LORD's Body and Blood? Then let them either change their opinion, or abstain from offering what has been aforesaid. But our sentiment is agreeable with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn confirms our sentiment. For we offer to Him what is His, agreeably proclaiming the communion and unity of the flesh and the SPIRIT. For as the Bread which is of earth, receiving the invocation of GOD, is now not common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly: so too our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are now not corruptible, having hope of the resurrection."<sup>1</sup> It is clear, according to this most ancient Father, that the presence of CHRIST in the Eucharist is effected, not by the faith of the recipient, (though that be necessary to his salutary communion,) but by the faith and act of the Church in *consecration*. (Thornd. *Just Weights*, c. XXI. §. 8.) If so, how do they that make the Presence depend on the faith of the recipient receive CHRIST in the Eucharist more than out of it? Or how will they maintain it to be any way necessary? Bishop Bailey (though a Puritan) writes thus: "It is *not our faith* that makes the Body and Blood of CHRIST to be present: but the Spirit of CHRIST dwelling in Him and us." (*Practice of Piety*, p. 322, ed. London, 1682.) S. Clement of Alexandria writes; "The Blood of the LORD is twofold; for the one is His carnal Blood, whereby we have been ransomed from corruption; the other is spiritual, that is, wherewith we have been anointed. And this is to drink the Blood of JESUS, to partake of the LORD's incorruption. And the power of the WORD is the SPIRIT, as the blood is of flesh. Analogously then the wine is mixed with water, but the SPIRIT with man. The mixed wine entertains with a view to faith; but the SPIRIT leads to incorruption; and again the mixture of both, of the drink and the WORD, is called *Eucharist*;

<sup>1</sup> S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæreses*, Lib. iv. c. 34, p. 363.

whereof they that partake according to faith are sanctified both in body and soul, when the FATHER'S will mystically mingles with the SPIRIT and WORD, Man, the Divine mixture. For of a truth the SPIRIT is familiar with the soul that is rapt by Him; and the flesh with the WORD, (the flesh) for whose sake the WORD was made flesh."<sup>m</sup> Origen asks the Marcionites to explain on their theory, "of what manner of flesh, or of what body, or of what manner of blood giving Bread and the Cup as images, gave He charge to His disciples to make the memorial of Him by means of them?"<sup>n</sup> Tertullian is full on this subject. Quoting Jeremiah after the Septuagint, 'Come, let us put wood into his bread,'<sup>o</sup> he adds; "Into His Body, doubtless. For so GOD hath revealed it in your Gospel also, calling bread His Body, that hence also you may now understand that He hath given to bread the figure of His Body, Whose Body in ages back the Prophet figured into bread; the Lord Himself being afterwards to interpret this mystery."<sup>p</sup> Again, he argues, that, as CHRIST hath chosen Bread and Wine to be by a natural analogy types and figures of His Blessed Body and Blood, we are thereby sufficiently given to understand that that Body and Blood were not phantastic, but real and substantial, even as their figures were palpable and substantial. "When He had taken bread and distributed it to His disciples, He made it that Body of His, saying, This is My Body, that is, a figure of My Body. But it would not have been a figure, unless there were a real Body." Passing on to the delineation of CHRIST as the warrior from Bozrah whose garments were red as from the wine-press, he proceeds: "Much more plainly did the book of Genesis, in the blessing of Judah from whose tribe the enrolment of CHRIST'S flesh was to proceed, even then delineate CHRIST in Judah. 'He shall wash His garments in wine and His clothes in the blood of the grape;'<sup>q</sup> showing the garments and clothes to be His flesh and the wine His blood. So also He, Who then figured

<sup>m</sup> S. Clem. Alex. Pædag. Lib. ii. c. 2, p. 111.

<sup>n</sup> Origen, c. Marcion. §. 4, p. 116.

<sup>o</sup> Jer. xi. 19. Δεῖτε, καὶ ἐμβάλωμεν

ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ.

<sup>p</sup> Tert. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iii.

19, p. 408. Cf. Adv. Judæos, c. 10 p. 196.

<sup>q</sup> Gen. xlix. 11.

wine in blood, hath now consecrated His Blood in wine.”<sup>r</sup> S. Augustine takes the same view: “Moreover His dress, which He washes in the wine, that is, cleanses from sins in His own Blood, the sacrament of which Blood the baptized know, whence also he adds, ‘And His clothes in the blood of the grape,’ what is it but the Church?”<sup>s</sup> Again: “His is the multitude of corn and wine,<sup>t</sup> that is, the multitude which corn and wine gathers in the sacrament of His Body and Blood.”<sup>u</sup> S. Cyril of Jerusalem writes: “‘O taste and see that the LORD is good.’ Do not entrust your judgment to your corporal throat, nay, but to unwavering faith. For in tasting they are not bidden to taste of bread and wine, but of the corresponding Body and Blood of CHRIST.”<sup>v</sup> S. Macarius says, “that in the Church there is offered bread and wine, corresponding with His Flesh and Blood; and they that partake of the apparent bread spiritually eat the Flesh of the LORD.”<sup>w</sup>

§. 4. The Latin Church follows the Schoolmen in attributing the consecration of the elements of Bread and Wine to a mystic virtue in the act of reciting a portion only of our LORD’S words in the original institution, namely, ‘This is My Body’—‘This is My Blood.’ The Greek Church makes it depend on the Prayer in which she invokes the HOLY GHOST to render the elements the Body and Blood of CHRIST; in

Consecration of the Eucharist, how effected.

<sup>r</sup> Tert. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. c. 40, pp. 457, 8. Cf. “Nec panem (reprobavit), quo ipsum corpus suum representat.” Adv. Marcion. Lib. i. c. 14, p. 372.

<sup>s</sup> S. Aug. De Civ. Dei, Lib. xvi. c. 41, p. 452.

<sup>t</sup> Gen. xxvii. 28.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. c. 37, p. 448.

<sup>v</sup> S. Cyrill. Hierosol. Cateches. Mystagog. v. §. 17, p. 300.

<sup>w</sup> S. Macarii Homil. 27. p. 372. So also the Apostolical Constitutions: “*παράδοις δὲ ἡμῖν τὰ ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια τοῦ τιμίου σώματος Ἀβροῦ καὶ αἵματος.*” (Lib. v. c. 13, ap. Labbe. Tom. I. p. 358.) And, “*τὴν ἀντίτυπον τοῦ βασιλείου σώματος Χριστοῦ δεκτὴν εὐχαριστίαν προσφέρετε.*” (Ibid. L. vi. c. 29, p. 411.) And the Author of the book *De Sacramentis*:

“Dicit sacerdos: Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.” (Lib. iv. c. 5, ap. S. Ambrosii Opp. Tom. II. p. 371.) Damascene struggles against this view; “But if,” he says, “some have called the bread and wine ‘corresponding with (*ἀντίτυπα*) the Body and Blood of the LORD,’ they said it not after consecration, but so calling the Oblation before it has been consecrated.” (c. 90.) So too the Benedictine Editors seek to limit the application of the term ‘figura’ to the Elements as they lie for a few moments on the Altar previously to Consecration, to save the tenet of Transubstantiation. (See in loc. S. Amb. *supra* citato.)

other words, to be effected by the solemn 'Blessing' and 'Thanksgiving,' which CHRIST Himself, following Rabbinical usage, employed at the institution, and which procured the Rite its special designation of *Eucharist*. S. Paul's words, that 'every creature of God is sanctified by the word of God and prayer,' (1 *Tim.* iv. 3-5,) and his attaching such weight to the Eucharistic thanksgiving, (1 *Cor.* xiv. 16, 17), may afford a fair presumption that this, and not the rehearsal of the words of the Gospel, is the true solution of the question. (See Thornd. *Laws of the Church*, Bk. III. ch. 4). Observe that it is the performance of "this our bounden duty and service" that effects the consecration *ex opere operato*, not the "weighing our merits" *ex opere operantis*. (*Ibid.* c. V. 26, 38).

Of the  
change  
effected by  
Consecra-  
tion in the  
Eucharist.

§. 5. The relation between the *sacraments* or outward symbols and the Thing signified and represented by them is described by the Fathers as being of so intimate a character, that they scruple not to say that the symbols are changed and converted into, and *are*, the Body and Blood of CHRIST; while at the same time terms are employed inconsistent with any notion of a physical and material, or, as some would say, substantial change. "Nor is the mysterious and sacramental presence of the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST in the Eucharist ever a whit more destructive to the bodily presence of the elements than the invisible presence of the HOLY GHOST or angels to the visible presence of those things in which they were," that is, fiery tongues, winds, &c. (*Thornd.* IV. i. 24.)

But when Thorndike, having illustrated the sacramental interchange of terms applying to the Sign and to the Thing signified by reference to the communication of properties in the One Person of CHRIST, proceeds to pronounce the "supernatural union between the Body and Blood of CHRIST and the bread and wine" as being only "from the consecration to the receiving," he lays down an arbitrary solution of the Mystery, such as he blames in the notion of Transsubstantiation. Of two parts, the one outward and material, the other inward and spiritual, the one subject to the examination of our senses, the other apprehensible by faith only, the Church Catholic prefers to dwell on the latter as containing the earnest of "the fulness of joy," making comparatively slight

mention of the outward vehicle of Its Presence. Thus S. Justin Martyr writes: "For we do not receive them as common bread or common drink; but as JESUS CHRIST our SAVIOUR having been made flesh by the word of GOD had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food which has been thanked for by prayer of the word that is from Him, whereby our flesh and blood are nourished in the way of conversion, is both Flesh and Blood of that JESUS that was made flesh." \* S. Irenæus derives from this mysterious conversion an argument against those who denied the resurrection of the body. "For when," he says, "the mixed cup and broken bread receives the Word of GOD, it becomes the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, out of which the substance of our flesh is augmented and consists; how do they deny that the flesh is capable of the gift of GOD, which is life eternal, (that flesh) which is nourished with the Body and Blood of CHRIST and (is) His member?" † Origen bears witness to the change thus: "But we, doing that which is agreeable to the Creator of the universe, eat the loaves that are offered with thanksgiving and prayer that is (said) over the oblations, having become through the prayer a holy Body sanctifying those that use it with a sound purpose." ‡ S. Cyril of Jerusalem says, "We beseech the merciful GOD to send the HOLY GHOST upon the proposed oblations, that He may make the bread the Body of CHRIST, and the wine the Blood of CHRIST; for in every way, whatsoever the HOLY GHOST hath touched, that hath been sanctified and changed." § And S. Ambrose: "Perchance you may say, It is another thing that I see, how do you tell me that I receive CHRIST's Body? And this yet remains for us to prove. How many examples then do we use? Let us prove that this is not what nature hath formed but what benediction hath consecrated; and that the power of benediction exceeds that of nature, because even nature itself is

\* *Apologia pro Christianis* II. Opp. p. 98.

† *Adv. Hæreses*, Lib. v. c. 2, p. 434.

‡ *Contra Celsum*, Lib. viii. p. 414: τοὺς ἄρτους ἐσθίωμεν, σῶμα γενομένους

διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίον τι, καὶ ἁγίδιον τοὺς μετὰ ὀργίους προθέσεως αὐτῷ χραμένων.

§ τοῦτο ἡγιάσται καὶ μεταβέβηται. Cateches. *Mystagog.* v. §. 5, p. 297.

changed by benediction.”<sup>b</sup> Again; “And this Body which we make (*quod conficimus corpus*) is of the Virgin. Why seekest thou here the order of nature in CHRIST’s Body, when the LORD JESUS Himself was born of the Virgin beside nature? True doubtless is the Flesh of CHRIST, which was crucified, which was buried; truly then is it the Sacrament of His Flesh.”<sup>c</sup>

Change not  
such as to  
obliterate  
the physical  
substance of  
the Sacra-  
ment.

§. 6. Accompanying these statements we find others which are inconsistent with the notion of a physical or material change of the Elements. This change is commonly understood by the term *Transsubstantiation* or the passing onward of the natural into a supernatural substance. It is a scholastic question. Let the thinker abstract every quality he can think of from the Elements and then resolve the nature of the *substance* or residuum; or confess that after abstracting the said qualities or ‘accidents,’ (which yet physically remain), the *substance* evades him, rather say that in physical things the aggregate of accidents is identical with ‘substance.’ We may assume Durandus’ maxim as a safe one on this mysterious subject; “It doth not behove us to superadd difficulties to the difficulties of faith.”<sup>d</sup> The Fathers do not. Tertullian speaks of wine, “which CHRIST hath consecrated into the memorial of His Blood.”<sup>e</sup> S. Cyprian gives as the reason for mixing the Cup with water the symbolical union of Christians with their Head. If the water remains as it was before consecration, so by like reason should the wine, viewed by itself. “If a person,” as Cyprian argues, “offer wine only, the Blood of CHRIST begins to be without us; but if there be water alone, the people begins to be without CHRIST; but when either is blended and by a sort of union mutually coupled, then is the spiritual and heavenly Sacrament accomplished.”<sup>f</sup> S. Augustine likewise uses this language; “He then who is in the unity of His Body, that

<sup>b</sup> De Mysteriis, c. 9. Tom. II. p. 338.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* p. 339. So also the book *De Sacramentis*; “Tu forte dicis: Meus panis est usitatus. Sed panis iste panis est ante verba sacramentorum: ubi accesserit consecratio,

de pane fit caro Christi.” *Ibid.* p. 368.

<sup>d</sup> In Lib. 4. Sent. Dist. 11, qu. 3, §. 5.

<sup>e</sup> De Anima, c. 17, p. 276.

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 63, Tom. II. p. 154.

is, in the structure of Christian members, the Sacrament of which Body the faithful communicating are wont to take from the altar, he is truly said to eat the Body of CHRIST and to drink His Blood." <sup>a</sup> And, repudiating the notion that Sacrifice was offered to the Martyrs, he says: "He (the Priest) sacrifices to GOD, not to them, albeit he may sacrifice in their Memorial (or place dedicated in remembrance of them): because he is GOD's priest, not theirs. But the Sacrifice itself is the Body of CHRIST, Which is not offered to them, because this they themselves also are." <sup>b</sup> Again: "Hereby He is also Priest, Himself the offerer, Himself too the oblation. The Sacrament whereof He hath willed the daily Sacrifice of the Church to be; who, since she is the body of the Head Himself, learns to offer herself through Him." <sup>c</sup> S. Athanasius, commenting on the sacred words, 'This is My Blood,' remarks, "Although the wine is not the Lord's Blood, but (that) of the vine." <sup>d</sup> S. Cyril of Jerusalem compares the change effected by consecration to the desecration of meats by being offered to idols. "For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the holy invocation of the adorable TRINITY, were bare bread and wine; but when the invocation is made, the bread becomes CHRIST's Body and the wine CHRIST's Blood; after the same fashion certainly, such meats of Satan's pomp, being in their proper nature bare, by the invocation of the demons become impure." <sup>e</sup> He also compares the effect of consecration of the bread and wine to that of Chrism: "But see you do not suppose that ointment to be bare. For as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the HOLY GHOST is no longer bare bread but CHRIST's Body; so also this holy ointment is no longer bare, nor, as one may say, common, after the invocation, but CHRIST's gift and by the presence of the HOLY GHOST become operative of His Divinity." <sup>f</sup> S. Chrysostom says: "When therefore the WORD saith, 'This is My Body,' let us both obey and believe and

<sup>a</sup> De Civitate Dei, Lib. xxi. c. 25. Tom. VII. p. 646.

<sup>b</sup> Ib. L. xxii. c. 10, p. 674.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. L. x. c. 20, p. 256.

<sup>d</sup> *καίπερ οὐχ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐστὶν ὁ οἶνος, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀμύλου.* S. Athanas.

De Fide, ap. Montfaucon. Collect. Nov. Patrum, Tom. II. p. 18.

<sup>e</sup> Cateches. Mystagog. I. §. 4, p. 281.

<sup>f</sup> Cateches. Myst. III. §. 3, p. 289.



regard It with eyes of the mind ; for CHRIST hath delivered to us nothing sensuous, but in sensuous transactions, yet all objects of the understanding."<sup>m</sup> I purposely omit the famous passage in his letter to Cæsarius ; and pass on to the very clear words of Theodoret, most important on account of the influence which they are said to have had at a momentous period in English Church history, and deserving of the most dispassionate examination. I give the entire context, as it relates to the subject of the Eucharist.

"*Orthodoxus*. Tell me then, the mystic symbols offered by the priests to GOD, of what are they symbols ? *Eranistes*. Of the LORD'S Body and Blood. *Orthod*. Of what is really a body or not really ? *Eran*. Of what is really. *Orthod*. Very good ; for there must needs be the original of a picture, since painters too imitate nature and paint the likenesses of things that are seen. *Eran*. True. *Orthod*. If then the Divine Mysteries correspond with that which is really a body, it follows the Body of the LORD is body even now, not converted into the nature of Godhead, but fulfilled with Divine glory. *Eran*. You have opportunely raised discussion concerning the Divine Mysteries ; for I will thence demonstrate to you the conversion of the LORD'S Body into another nature. Reply then to my questions. *Orthod*. I will reply. *Eran*. What do you call the offered gift before the priestly invocation ? *Orthod*. There is no need to say clearly, for it is likely some of the uninitiated are present. *Eran*. Let the answer be riddle-wise. *Orthod*. The meat of such and such grains. *Eran*. And how name we the other symbol ? *Orthod*. This name too is common, signifying a kind of drink. *Eran*. But after the consecration how do you style them ? *Orthod*. The Body of CHRIST, and the Blood of CHRIST. *Eran*. And do you believe that you partake of CHRIST'S Body and Blood ? *Orthod*. I believe so. *Eran*. As then the symbols of CHRIST'S Body and Blood are different before the priestly invocation, but after it are converted and become other ; so the LORD'S Body after the Ascension was converted into the Divine Essence. *Orthod*. You are caught in the meshes

<sup>m</sup> ἅλλ' αἰσθητοῖς μὲν πράγμασι, πάντα δὲ νοητὰ. In Ev. S. Matt. Hom. 82, Tom. II. p. 513.

which you wove ; since not even after the consecration do the mystical symbols depart from their proper nature. For they remain in their former essence and figure and form, and are visible and tangible, even as they were before ; but they are understood to be what they have become, and are believed and adored, as being those things which they are believed to be. Set the picture then by the original, and you will see the resemblance ; since the figure must be like the reality. For That Body too hath its former figure and shape and circumference, and, to speak summarily, the essence of the body. But after the Ascension It is become immortal and superior to corruption, and hath been deemed worthy of the session on the Right Hand, and is adored by all creation, inasmuch as it is styled the Body of the LORD of Nature. *Eran.* Yet nevertheless the mystical symbol changes its former appellation. For it is no longer called what it was called before, but is styled Body. The reality must needs then be called GOD and not Body. *Orthod.* You seem to me to be inattentive. For it is not styled Body only, but also Bread of Life. So has the LORD Himself called It. And we name the Body Itself ' Divine Body ' and ' Lifegiving ' and ' the LORD's ' ; teaching how that It is not common to any man, but (is) our LORD JESUS CHRIST's, Who is GOD and Man, ' JESUS CHRIST the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.'"<sup>a</sup> It will be seen from the above statements, that the change effected by consecration is of a relative kind ; that it is not regarded as of so *intrinsic* and absolute a character as to exclude the former nature of the elements, but rather as the introduction of a new and foreign essence. This is shown by the argument derived from the analogy which Christians perceived to exist between the condition of the consecrated Elements, now no longer bare and empty but to the eye of faith interpenetrated by the glorious Body and Blood of our Risen IMMANUEL, and that of the Human Nature of CHRIST after His Ascension. As that Human Nature of JESUS, both body and soul, is not absorbed by His Divinity, but remains unconfused at the right hand of GOD ; so the

<sup>a</sup> Theod. Dialog. ii. Opp. Tom. IV. pp. 84—86.

Elements do not lose their former grossness and bulk and substance by their sacramental relation to the holy Things signified by them. And again, as CHRIST'S Human Nature, sometimes even on earth shared in the glory of that Divine WORD with Which it was indissolubly united, as on the Mount of Transfiguration and on the Sea of Tiberias; so the symbolizing Elements are by virtue of CHRIST'S words so overshadowed by His Divine Presence as to become supernaturally and for the purposes of faith His most precious Body and Blood. "In the whole work of the Mediator's office the Divine nature communicated with the Human," by which communication "the Flesh of CHRIST becomes present wheresoever His promise . . . requires it." (*Thornd.* Vol. IV. Pt. I. pp. 45, 42.) Thorndike concludes, "that the elements are really changed, translated, turned, and converted into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, (so that whoso receiveth them with a living faith is spiritually nourished by the same, he that with a dead faith, is guilty of crucifying CHRIST." (*Ibid.* p. 82.) After this explicit testimony, he subscribes to the opinion of Facundus bishop of Hermiana (p. 88,) explaining away his own strong terms; and talks of Damascene as 'this man'! (p. 92.) leaving an impression of bewilderment. This change has been variously styled a *change* (μεταβολή) or *transformation* (μεταμόρφωσις), or *transelementation* (μεταστοιχείωσις), or after the time of S. John Damascene *transsubstantiation* (μετουσίωσις). But as in the case of the term *consubstantial*, which fails in adequately representing the delicacy of the GREEK HOMOOUSIOS; so the terms *substance* and *transsubstantiation* are apt to mislead, and to suggest notions of a physical change not necessarily involved in OUSIA and METOUSIOSIS. For if we dismiss the consideration of those outward accidents and qualities which meet the senses, and regard only the OUSIA, Essence, or Substance which is cognisable by the intellect only,\* it can scarcely be denied that the essence of the Elements is transposed by consecration, in that the inward part or thing signified by them becomes superadded.

\* "Intellectu solum discernitur hoc quod subjacet corporibus." Origen. *Peri Archon*, Lib. iv. p. 475.

§. 7. But, while guarding against any gross or carnal notions which may have been engendered by the term 'Transubstantiation,' it is my duty to exhibit the uniform testimony borne by Antiquity to the Real and objective Presence of CHRIST in the Eucharist under the forms or species of Bread and Wine. Certainly, no language could have been chosen so well adapted to convey and perpetuate such a notion, as the following. Tertullian upbraids image-makers with their impiety in "applying to the LORD's Body those hands which confer bodies on demons."<sup>p</sup> He says of Christians, that they feast on "the richness of the LORD's Body, namely, the Eucharist."<sup>q</sup> S. Cyprian says of the lapsed: "Because he doth not forthwith receive the LORD's Body with stained hands, or with polluted mouth drink the LORD's Blood, the sacrilegious man is angry with the priests."<sup>r</sup> S. Optatus remonstrates with the Donatists on their desecration of Catholic altars: "For what is there so sacrilegious as to break, scrape, remove the altars of GOD, whereon ye also sometime offered? Whereon the vows of the people and the members of CHRIST have been borne, where Almighty GOD hath been invoked, where being besought the HOLY GHOST hath descended, whence hath been received by many the pledge of eternal salvation and the safeguard of faith and the hope of the resurrection"<sup>s</sup> Again: "In what had CHRIST offended you, Whose Body and Blood dwelt there certain moments?"<sup>t</sup> S. Ambrose writes: "It is the hand, which, a conciliator of Divine grace, is laid on the sacred altars, whereby we offer and take heavenly Sacraments: it is the hand, which operates alike and dispenses Divine Mysteries."<sup>u</sup> S. Cyril of Alexandria writes, (and his words being recited and registered at Ephesus derive a sanction from the Third General Council): "Declaring the Death after the flesh of the Only-Begotten SON of GOD, JESUS CHRIST, and confessing His Resurrection from the dead and Ascension into heaven, we perform the unbloody Sacrifice in the churches; and so we approach the

Of the objective character of the Real Presence.

<sup>p</sup> De Idololatria, c. 7. p. 88.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* p. 94.

<sup>r</sup> De Pudicitia, c. 9. p. 562.

<sup>s</sup> Hexaëmeron, Lib. vi. c. 9. Tom.

<sup>t</sup> De Lapsis, Opp. Tom. I. p. 131. I. p. 140.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. vi. p. 93.

mystical blessings and are sanctified, having become partakers both of the holy Flesh and of the precious Blood of CHRIST the SAVIOUR of us all; not receiving It as common flesh, GOD forbid! nor yet as of a man sanctified and connected with the WORD by the unity of dignity or as possessing a Divine indwelling, but as truly life-giving and proper to the WORD Himself."† S. Leo says; "For otherwise in the Church of GOD, which is the Body of CHRIST, neither are our priesthoods allowed nor our sacrifices real, unless in our nature the true High-priest reconcile us, the very Blood of the immaculate LAMB cleanse us."‡ It is superfluous to cite the witness of ancient Liturgies, for they are universally express and abundant on this point.\* I find satisfaction in citing the words of S. Gerard the Apostle of Hungary, A.D. 1046, which seem to prove that at that time, while fully admitting the reality of the change effected in a mystery, men yet recognized that the inward reception was *by faith*. "This, *which is received inwardly by faith*, should be found outwardly sweet as well." (*Sanct. Cath.* p. 383.) I will conclude in the words of one who represents a far different type of religion: "So in the communion which we have in CHRIST'S Body and Blood we must say, that it is a spiritual mystery, which can neither be seen by the eyes nor be comprehended by man's understanding. It is therefore shown by figures and signs which fall under the sense of the eyes, as the weakness of our nature requires; in such wise however, that it be not a bare and simple figure, but conjoined with its verity and substance. And so it must be confessed, if the representation which GOD employs in the Supper be real, that the inward substance of the Sacrament is joined to the visible signs; and that, as bread is distributed in the hand, so the Body of CHRIST is communicated to us that we may be partakers of Him."†

The black  
Rubric.

§. 8. When the infelicitously worded Rubric, appended to the Anglican Communion Office, asserts that CHRIST'S Body is "in Heaven and not here," on such a ground as

† *Ap. Labbe. Tom. III. p. 403.*

‡ *Epist. 40 ap. Labbe. Tom. III. p. 1319.*

\* *E.g., vide Renaudot. Liturg.*

*Orient Tom. II. p. 33. Mabillon. De Liturgia Gallicana, pp. 202, 208.*

† *Calvin. De Cœna Domini, Opp. Tom. VII. p. 3. See also Institut. Lib. iv. c. 17. §. 11. Tom. VI. p. 281.*

the assumption "it being against the truth of CHRIST'S natural Body to be at one time in more places than one," it begs the question. For 1. CHRIST'S natural Body is now a glorious spiritual Body, the conditions whereof are not known to us. The natural Body does not co-exist with a spiritual Body, but has past by virtue of the resurrection into the spiritual, reserving the faculty of affirming its identity when and as GOD wills. So that alleged visions of the Sacred Humanity prove nothing against the change effected by the resurrection. 2. It is hypostatically united with the Godhead of the Incarnate WORD; so that it may accomplish that which requires the infinite Power of GOD to effect. (*Thornd.* Vol. IV. Pt. I. ch. iii. §. 13. p. 47.) Dr. Pusey charges Luther with Eutychianism, (Preface to *Sermons*, Vol. I.); but see Thorndike, *ubi supra*. Our LORD's partaking of food after His resurrection was a human act; but owing to the hypostatic union it was also the act of GOD. 3. Such presumed physical necessity depends on laws, which GOD has imposed on Nature and may abrogate or suspend at His pleasure, as He suspended the action of fire and water in the miracles of the Three Children and Eliseus. (Leibniz, *Théodicée*.) How unworthy of these 'holy Mysteries' this quibbling Rubric is, is seen when a fervent lover of GOD, steeped in the holy Scriptures, and full of faith, yet a Protestant, (General Gordon), attempts to expound the Real Presence, he is driven to accept either 1. Transsubstantiation; or 2. a variant of the Holy Grail, the Blood of GOD borne by angels and miraculously infused into the chalice.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

## OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

Universal  
witness of  
Antiquity to  
the Sacrifice  
of the Eu-  
charist.

§. 1. It would be a nugatory exhibition of the doctrine of the Catholic Church touching the Eucharist, if we suppressed the fact of its being universally regarded as a representative and commemorative Sacrifice. Some may at once object that there is no direct testimony of Scripture on its behalf. But this, if any, is eminently a case of weighing the effect, purport, bearings, analogies, in a word, of the mind of Scripture. And if the consent of Christian Antiquity be worth anything at all, it must surely tell here; for there is no point of doctrine so undisputed in the first ages of the Church, so universally admitted by all sects and parties. The application of the term *Sacrifice* to the Eucharistic Ordinance, and consequently of that of *Altar* to the Communion Table, and of *Sacrificer*, *Hiereus*, or *Sacerdos* to the Minister, arose from the general principle of analogy traceable between the institutions of the Law and the Gospel. As the Sacrament of Baptism had succeeded to the place occupied by Circumcision under the old Covenant; so it was felt, that the Ordinance, which so vividly set forth the Passion of CHRIST, might with even better reason be termed a Sacrifice than that Passover, which simply commemorated the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt. Nor did it imply an obscuring of the grand central truth of CHRIST's one and only Oblation of Himself and Atonement fully accomplished on the Cross, if the rite appointed by Him to perpetually commemorate that Atonement derived lustre from the great fact which it served to exhibit. Nor was it an infringement on the Priestly office of CHRIST, if His Ministers shared with Him the title of

Priests, because of the high honour to which they are admitted of sacramentally "showing the LORD's death till He come."<sup>a</sup> For the principle of participation in the attributes of our Incarnate Head by us His members is everywhere declared in the New Testament. Is He GOD as well as Man, the WORD made flesh? In Him we are to be "partakers of the Divine nature."<sup>a</sup> Is he the Atoning SAVIOUR? "He hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation;" "we pray you in CHRIST's stead, be ye reconciled to GOD."<sup>b</sup> But as those attributes, when applied to us, are used, not in a proper but in a derivative sense; so the term *sacrifice* is applied to the Eucharist only in a derivative sense, not terminating in itself, but going on to that Mystery of CHRIST's true and proper Sacrifice of Himself, once for all offered, but which is here most solemnly pleaded and sacramentally exhibited. I might insist on such a text, as that where our LORD prescribes reconciliation to him who brings his gift to the altar,<sup>c</sup> which if limited to the Jewish Polity finds no room among precepts intended for all time; or S. Paul's "O foolish Galatians, *before whose eyes* JESUS CHRIST hath been evidently set forth, *crucified among you*?"<sup>d</sup> or, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle;"<sup>e</sup> without giving up the right to apply them to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it is sufficient that the command, "This do in remembrance of Me," has authorized us "to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again;"<sup>f</sup> and that the whole céremonial act of breaking the Bread and pouring out the Wine, in connection with faith in the merits and death of CHRIST there exhibited, fully entitles it to the name of Sacrifice as much and more than the mere typical ordinance of the Passover. I will now proceed to give examples of the *consensus* of the Ancient Church touching the Eucharist's being a Sacrifice. S. Ignatius writes: "Be ye earnest then to use one Eucharist, for there is one Flesh of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and one Cup for uniting of His

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 26.

<sup>b</sup> 2 S. Peter i. 4.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Cor. v. 19, 20.

S. Matt. v. 23.

<sup>d</sup> Gal. iii. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. xiii. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Communion Office



Blood, one Altar.”<sup>a</sup> S. Justin Martyr: “All then, who through this Name offer Sacrifices, which JESUS CHRIST hath enjoined to be done, that is, in the thanksgiving of the Bread and of the Cup, that are performed everywhere by Christians, GOD in anticipation testifies to be agreeable to him.”<sup>b</sup> S. Irenæus: “But also giving counsel to His disciples to offer to GOD firstfruits of His creatures, not as though to one in need, but that themselves might neither be unfruitful nor ungrateful, He took that which by creation is bread, and gave thanks, saying, ‘This is my Body.’ And the Cup likewise, which is of that creation in accordance with us, He confessed to be His Blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles offers in all the world to GOD, to Him who affords us nourishment, the firstfruits of His gifts in the New Testament; concerning which Malachi thus prophesied; ‘I have no pleasure in you, saith the LORD of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering: for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts.’”<sup>c</sup> Hereby most plainly signifying, how that the former people indeed hath ceased to offer to GOD, but in every place Sacrifice is offered to Him and that a pure one, and His Name is glorified among the Gentiles.”<sup>d</sup> In Tertullian’s time it has become a settled usage to speak of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice. “To you” (he addresses Christian women) “no occasion of going from home is other than serious. Either some sick brother is visited, or Sacrifice is offered, or GOD’S Word is ministered.”<sup>e</sup> S. Cyprian writes: “When we meet in one place with the brethren, and celebrate Divine sacrifices with GOD’S priest, we should be mindful of modesty and discipline.”<sup>f</sup> And again: “Who is more a Priest of the Most

<sup>a</sup> Epist. ad Philadelphenses, c. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 344.

<sup>c</sup> Mal. i. 10, 11.

<sup>d</sup> Adv. Hæreses, Lib. iv. c. 32, p. 355.

<sup>e</sup> De Cultu Fœminarum, Lib. ii.

c. 11. p. 159. He also applies “munditiæ sacrificiorum” as the fulfilment of Malachi’s prophecy. Vid. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iii. c. 22. p. 410.

<sup>f</sup> De Oratione Dominica, Tom. 1.

High GOD than our LORD JESUS CHRIST? Who offered sacrifice to GOD the FATHER, the same that Melchizedek offered, that is, Bread and Wine, to wit, His own Body and Blood."<sup>m</sup> Although the Septuagint and Vulgate, following the Hebrew, employ no sacrificial term, but *ἐφ-ήνεγκεν* and 'proferens,' signifying the production of refreshments for Abram's weary troops, the act of Melchizedek in 'blessing' Abram, coupled with the mention of his priesthood, implies *some oblation* to justify what was a priestly act; as Isaac's blessing his sons was preceded by a solemn feast on a sacrifice. I think it clear that an oblation to GOD preceded the consumption of the bread and wine by Abram's people, as the Eucharist was taken out of the oblations of the Agape. The Apostolic Constitutions say, "Instead of bloody sacrifice He hath enjoined the reasonable and unbloody and mystical one of His Body and Blood, which is accomplished symbolically, with reference to His Death."<sup>n</sup> S. Augustine speaks of "the participation of that Table, which the Priest Himself the Mediator of the New Testament exhibits, after the order of Melchizedek, of His own Body and Blood. For that Sacrifice has succeeded to all those sacrifices of the Old Testament which were immolated in a shadow of the future. Wherefore also we recognise the voice of the same Mediator speaking by prophecy in the thirty-ninth Psalm, 'Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me.'<sup>o</sup> Because instead of all those sacrifices and oblations His Body is being offered and ministered to the partakers."<sup>p</sup> In the time of the First Council of Toledo, about A.D. 400, it has even come to be called the Daily Sacrifice.<sup>q</sup>

§. 2. But when we ask what title may be pretended for the august and venerable language, which all Antiquity ever applies to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it must be repeated that

The Eucharist a commemorative and representative Sacrifice.

p. 140. See also De Unitate Ecclesiae, T. I. p. 116; and Epist. i. T. II. p. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Epist. 63, T. II. p. 149.

<sup>n</sup> Lib. vi. c. 23, *ap.* Labbe. Tom.

I p. 403.

<sup>o</sup> Ps. xl. 6; Heb. x. 5.

<sup>p</sup> De Civitate Dei. Lib. xvii. c. 20. T. VII. p. 484. See also *Ibid.*

L. xvii. c. 5. T. VII. p. 467; L. xvi. c. 22. T. VII. p. 435. Tractat. adv. Judæos, c. 9. T. VIII. p. 38. Lib. ad Honoratum, c. 19. T. II. p. 439. De Spiritu et Littera, c. 11. T. X. p. 94.

<sup>q</sup> Conc. Toletan. I. Canon. 5. *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1224.

all depends on its being a true and lively portraiture of the One Sacrifice once for all offered on Calvary, and on its being the divinely appointed means of deriving the benefits thereof. Hence S. Cyprian says; "If JESUS CHRIST our LORD and GOD is Himself the Chief Priest of GOD the FATHER, and if He first offered Himself a sacrifice to His FATHER, and commanded that this be done in remembrance of Himself; surely that priest truly performs CHRIST's delegacy, who imitates that which He did: and offers then in the Church a true and full Sacrifice to GOD the FATHER, if he so begins to offer according as he sees CHRIST to have offered."<sup>r</sup> And again: "And because we make mention of His Passion in all sacrifices, (*for the Lord's Passion is the Sacrifice which we offer*), we ought to do nothing else but what He did."<sup>s</sup> Pleading the merit of the all-sufficient Sacrifice on the Cross, *not the mere* "benefit of those prayers which the Eucharist is celebrated with," is the point aimed at in the propitiatory Oblation of the Eucharist. (*Thornd.* Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 138.) "This Sacrifice," says S. Gregory the Great, "saves the soul from eternal perishing; which by a mystery renews for us the Death of the Only-Begotten; Who, although 'rising from the dead He now dieth no more, and death hath no more dominion over Him;'<sup>t</sup> yet in Himself living immortally and incorruptibly, He is again immolated for us in this mystery of the sacred oblation. Inasmuch as there His Body is taken, His Flesh distributed for the salvation of the people, His Blood is poured, not now in the hand of unbelievers, but into the mouths of the faithful. Hence then we judge of what sort is this Sacrifice on our behalf, which for our absolution ever imitates the Passion of the Only-Begotten SON. For which of the faithful can hold it doubtful, that at the very hour of the sacrifice at the priest's voice the heavens are opened, that in that mystery of JESUS CHRIST the choirs of angels are present, lowest things are associated with the highest, earthly things joined with those of heaven, a oneness also made of things visible and invisible."<sup>u</sup> This

<sup>r</sup> Epist. 63. T. II. p. 155.

<sup>s</sup> *Ibid.* p. 156.

<sup>t</sup> Rom. vi. 9.

<sup>u</sup> S. Greg. Magni Dialogg. L. iv c. 58. Opp. T. III. p. 348.—"You that are Scars of GOD's People

noble language of S. Gregory makes it clear, that, when he and others after him speak of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as *repairing* or *renewing* the Sacrifice of CHRIST, they meant not to say (GOD forbid!) that it added aught that was defective in that all-sufficient Oblation, nor yet to contradict S. Paul's assertion, "But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever (or, *in perpetuity*), sat down on the right hand of GOD." So Thorndike: "The Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross is *renewed* and revived unto the world's end" "in the consecration and communion of the Eucharist." (*Of the Laws of the Church*, Bk. III. ch. 2. Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 17.) But they intended to convey an adequate notion of the "dignity of those holy mysteries," where "we are one with CHRIST and He with us;" where (if anywhere) we "obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion;" where "we offer Himself to plead for us;" where by faith we "are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living GOD, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to GOD the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to JESUS the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."\*

§. 3. Seeing then that "it pleased the FATHER that in Him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things to Himself; by Him, I say, *whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven*;"† "seeing we also are compassed

In what sense it is said by the Ancients to be a sacrifice for the quick and dead.

must see to their due and awful receiving of the high Mysteries, τὰ ἁγία, as Damascene calls them, those pure and hallowed things of GOD. Especially that τὰ φρικτὸν, that φρικωδέστατον, as S. Chrysostom terms it, that Super-cælestial Food in the LORD'S Supper, which a Christian ought not once to think of, without a Sacred kind of Horror and Reverence. Here is an Action, I confess, wherein you can hardly exceed, either by expressing in yourselves, or by exacting from others, any circumstance of Awe and Reverence. I know it is safest

for a Child of the Church, to hold him still to the Canons of the Church. But if in any one thing, surely in this, the Canons are rather to be out-bidden, and exceeded, than any way neglected or abated." Dr. John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, (afterwards Abp. of York,) in his Charge to the Clergy of Lincoln; see Bp. Hackett's Life of Abp. Williams, p. 56.

\* Heb. x. 12.

† Liturg. Jacobi Baradati ap. Renaudot. T. II. p. 341.

\* Heb. xii. 22—24.

† Col. i. 19, 20.

about with so great a cloud of witnesses ;”<sup>a</sup> seeing also that we are one Body of CHRIST, and “that there should be no schism in the body ; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it ; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it ;”<sup>a</sup> and that “GOD hath provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect ;”<sup>b</sup> was it not reasonable, that this reconciliation of things in earth and things in heaven should be specially set forth in that Sacrament, which *shows* His death by Whom it is effected ; that the sympathies of the whole Church, visible and invisible, militant here on earth and “which are fallen asleep in CHRIST,”<sup>c</sup> should be associated in the pleading of His love Who ‘laid down His life’<sup>d</sup> for the whole ; and that the effusion of all ‘grace and heavenly benediction’ should be solemnly besought on behalf of the departed, because we herein plead the merits of His Passion, Who is our sole hope in this valley of tears, and the light of those who “lie down in green pastures, beside the still waters ?”<sup>e</sup> Accordingly we find Angels and Archangels associated in the Church’s ascription of glory to the FATHER ; in our First Liturgy, as in the ancient ones, “we give unto GOD most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all His Saints, from the beginning of the world ; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of His Son JESU CHRIST our LORD and GOD ; and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs ;”<sup>f</sup> and “we commend unto GOD’S mercy all other His servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith and now do rest in the sleep of peace.” This commendation of the departed in connection with the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is one of the strongest proofs of its representative and commemorative character ; for no one would suppose, that the mere Oblation of Bread and Wine was of any value apart from the mystery which they signify,

<sup>a</sup> Heb. xii. 1.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26.

<sup>c</sup> Heb. xi. 40.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 18.

<sup>e</sup> S. John xv. 13.

<sup>f</sup> Ps. xxiii. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Cardwell’s Liturgies, p. 296.

or that the Atonement made by CHRIST needed aught save its application. If there be any conceivable bond of union between the living and the dead, it must be their common interest in what CHRIST hath done for them. And if we may conceive a point on which may be concentrated all the efficacy of His Divine Atonement, it surely is that act which He hath enjoined as a memorial of Himself. Where then should the living seek communion with the Saints departed but in the sacred act, where the believer especially apprehends CHRIST, the "LAMB as it had been slain?"<sup>a</sup> From the earliest ages the Church pleaded for the quick and the dead, whensoever she pleaded the merits of their one Redeemer. "We make oblations for the departed on their birthdays annually," says Tertullian.<sup>b</sup> The Bishops, predecessors of S. Cyprian, provided, in a case of discipline, that "Sacrifice should not be offered for him (the delinquent), nor be celebrated for his repose."<sup>c</sup> A Synod held by S. Patrick in Ireland says; "He who in his lifetime shall not be meet to receive the Sacrifice, how shall it aid him after death?"<sup>d</sup> In a letter of the Bishops of Cappadocia to the Emperor Leo, they dwell upon it as a cruel aggravation of the atrocious murder of S. Proterius of Alexandria, that "not even after death did his enemies allow the deceased the oblation of the Sacrifice, but were eager to punish him as though beyond the law of nature."<sup>e</sup> And, to show that the Eucharistic intercession for the departed had not for its object their "remission from pain or guilt," it may be noticed that the Mozarabic Missal of Spain, probably the Rite of SS. Isidore and Ildefonse, offers the Oblation "for the spirits of those that rest, Hilary, Athanasius, Martin, &c."<sup>f</sup> The opinion of S. Augustine, that the oblations were thanksgivings for the very good,<sup>g</sup> seems to have influenced others to word it, 'for the glory of the Martyrs and for the repose of the dead.'<sup>h</sup> But it must be admitted, that, in proportion as

<sup>a</sup> Rev. v. 6.

<sup>b</sup> De Corona, c. 3. p. 102.

<sup>c</sup> "Pro dormitione ejus." S. Cypr. Epist. i. Tom. II. p. 3.

<sup>d</sup> Ap. Labbe, T. III. p. 1483.

<sup>e</sup> Conc. Chalcedon. Pt. iii. c. 51. Labbe. T. IV. p. 956.

<sup>f</sup> "Pro spiritibus pausantium."

Mabillon. De Liturgia Gallicana, L. i. c. 2, p. 12.

<sup>g</sup> "Pro valde bonis gratiarum actiones sunt, pro non valde malis propitiationes sunt." Enchiridion, c. 109, Opp. T. VI. p. 238.

<sup>h</sup> Missale Gothicum, De Liturg. Gallic. p. 298. Sacramentarium

purgatorial doctrines came to be mixed up with the practice of oblations for the dead, the bearings of the question were gradually changed or perverted.\*

Ceremonies  
illustrative  
of the Eu-  
charist.

§. 4. Furthermore, the representative character of the Eucharist is eminently set forth in the ceremonies which accompany it. And, first, its unity with that One Sacrifice which it represents is well expressed by the ancient custom of allowing only one celebration a day; a custom, which only the increased number of the faithful gave occasion to intermit.<sup>p</sup> Secondly, the mixture of the wine with water typifies the water and blood which issued from the SAVIOUR'S side on the Cross, and is affirmed to be an apostolical tradition.<sup>q</sup> Thirdly, according to S. Cyprian, the sacred Elements designate Christian unanimity; "for when the LORD calls bread His Body, moulded together from the uniting of many grains, He indicates that our people whom He bore is united; and when He calls wine His Blood, pressed out and collected into one out of many clusters and grapes, He again signifies our congregation, gathered by the commingling of a united multitude."<sup>r</sup> And the wine, being red, denotes the charity of the Church.<sup>s</sup> Much additional instruction may be gathered from what belongs strictly to the province of Ritual.

Of the Com-  
munion in  
one kind.

§. 5. The denial of the Cup to the laity was so recent an innovation, and so clearly opposed to ancient practice, that it formed one of the foremost objections of the Reformation against the existing Latin Church. It is difficult now to discover what advantage the clergy sought to secure by withholding the Chalice. But I must observe that the doctrine enjoined in our 'Communion of the Sick,' that a man hindered from partaking 'by lack of company' doth by internal

Gallic. *ap.* Mabillon. Mus. Ital. T. I. p. 286

\* Vid. S. Greg. Magni Dialogg. L. iv. c. 55, Opp. Tom. III. p. 345.

<sup>p</sup> "Cum solennior festivitas conventum populi numerosioris indixerit, et ad eam tanta fidelium multitudo convenerit, quam recipere basilica simul una non possit, sacrificii oblatio indubitanter iteretur. \* Necesse est autem, ut quedam pars populi sua devotione privetur, si,

unius tantum Misse *more servato*, sacrificium offerre non possint nisi qui prima diei parte convenerint." S. Leonis P.P. I. Epist. 81, *ap.* Labbe. T. III. p. 1375.

<sup>q</sup> S. Cyprian. Ep. 63, T. II. p. 148. Conc. Trullan. Canon. 32, *ap.* Bevereg. Synodic. T. I. p. 192.

<sup>r</sup> Ep. 69, T. II. p. 182.

<sup>s</sup> Jacob. à Vitriaco, Hist. Occident. c. 38, *ap.* Mabillon. De Lit. Gallican. p. 41.

acts of repentance, faith, remembrance, thanksgiving, 'eat and drink the Body and Blood of CHRIST profitably, although he receive not with his mouth,' tends to discredit the sincerity of the objection; seeing the objectors ready on so flimsy a pretext to dispense with Sacramental reception.

§. 6. On the subject of frequent reception of the Eucharist, it may be remarked, that, while in the first fervour of the infant Church of Jerusalem 'they continued daily in the breaking of the Bread,' 'later on we find 'the first day of the week' mentioned as the usual and stated day "when the disciples came together to eat bread." <sup>u</sup> S. Cyprian indeed, expounding the petition in the LORD'S Prayer 'Give us this day our daily bread,' speaks of Christians as daily receiving the Eucharist; <sup>v</sup> but it may be doubted, whether he does not give the explanation elsewhere, where he warns them to prepare for the impending persecution; "considering that therefore they daily drink the cup of the Blood of CHRIST, that they themselves also may be able to shed their blood for CHRIST'S sake." <sup>w</sup> Daily celebration does not appear to have been universal even in the time of Gregory the Great; for he mentions of Cassius Bishop of Narni as a noticeable fact, that he was wont to offer daily sacrifice to God.<sup>x</sup> The Author of the book *De Sacramentis* says; "Receive daily that which may daily profit thee. So live as to be fit to receive daily. He who is not fit to receive daily is not fit to receive after a year. How did holy Job offer sacrifice daily for his sons, lest perchance they might have sinned either in thought or in speech? Thou hearest then that as often as the Sacrifice is offered, the death of the LORD, His resurrection and ascension, are signified, and remission of sins; and dost thou not take that Bread of life daily? He who has a wound requires medicine. The wound is, that we are under sin; the medicine is the heavenly and venerable Sacrament." <sup>y</sup> "The receiving the Communion of the Eucharist daily," says Gennadius, "I neither praise nor blame. Yet I recommend

Of daily or  
frequent  
Communion.

<sup>u</sup> Acts ii. 42, 46.

<sup>v</sup> *Ibid.* xx. 7.

<sup>w</sup> De Orat. Domin., Tom. I. p. 147.

<sup>x</sup> Ep 58, T. II. p. 120.

<sup>y</sup> Diall. L. iv. c. 56, T. III. p.

346.

<sup>z</sup> Lib. v. c. 4, ap. S. Ambr. Opp. T. II. p. 378.



and exhort persons to communicate on all LORD'S Days, if however the mind be not disposed to sin. For I say, that one having still a mind to sin is burthened rather than purified by receiving the Eucharist." <sup>a</sup> Perhaps the advice of S. Bonaventure is best. "If a person be of as holy a disposition as the primitive Christians, who communicated daily, he will rightly imitate them. If he be far removed from them and be cold and languid after the condition of the Church of later times, it were better he should communicate less frequently. But if he be between those two extremes, it behoves him also to enter on a middle path, so as to communicate one while, another while out of reverence to abstain from the Sacrament." <sup>a</sup>

Of the  
spiritual na-  
ture of Holy  
Communion.

§. 7. In conclusion, it is pleasing to produce evidence from even the Middle Ages of the convictions of believers touching the pure and spiritual manner of CHRIST'S Presence in the Sacrament. Thus Paschasius Radbert, himself the champion of Transsubstantiation: "We should diligently understand, and worthily receive the spiritual Sacraments with the palate of the mind and the taste of faith, while our inner man through CHRIST'S grace intelligibly receives Divine things, and by their means is by virtue of faith made one body with CHRIST." <sup>b</sup> And Arnoldus De Bona Valle, alluding to the typical Sacrifices; "The flesh then we eat in this manner, but the bones we burn with fire; because the Sacraments indeed (which are as it were the Flesh of the Divine Virtue and the wrappers of the Truth) we visibly take according to their kind; but the substance Itself, according to its unintelligible and invisible state entirely firm and solid, we neither break nor minish, but cast into the flames, that is, commend to spiritual understandings; because 'spirit and life' are in the Divine Mysteries, nor is the knowledge of so great a thing allowed to be resolved by the human intellect. Therefore are we bidden to sacrifice the Lamb at night, because the reason of this work is not yet clearly evident, whereof

<sup>a</sup> De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis, c. 23, *ap.* S. Aug. T. VIII. App. p. 78.

<sup>a</sup> *Ap.* Petavii Dogm. Theolog. Tom. IV. p. 265.

<sup>b</sup> Paschasius Radbertus, Abbas Corbeiensis, De Corpore et Sanguine Domini, cap. 9, Ed. Colon. Agripp. 1550.

Faith is the minister; which the Truth will disclose in the splendours of the Saints, when the wine shall be drunk new in the kingdom of GOD, and with lighted lamps virgin souls be admitted to the eternal nuptials; and, when the unquenchable lamp hath been set on the candlestick, there shall shine to all who are in the house as well the verity of Sacraments as the reason of the TRINITY Itself.”<sup>c</sup>

• De Verbis Domini in Cruce, §. vi. pp. 13, 14, *ad calcem* S. Cypriani Opp. Ed. Fell Oxon. 1682.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

## OF THE POWER OF THE KEYS.

Statement  
of the Doc-  
trine of  
Penance.

§ 1. THE Eucharist is the great Sacrament, whereby "we obtain remission of sins and all other benefits of CHRIST'S Passion." But as it is clear that those who fall into grievous sin after Baptism *ipso facto* put themselves out of the covenanted terms of acceptance with GOD, for they "keep" not "His holy will and commandments," and therefore when known as open transgressors are fit subjects of exclusion from those benefits, the question meets us, Whether on their repentance they may be restored to the outward enjoyment of Church privileges, as they are presumed to be inwardly restored to GOD'S gracious favour? The answer of the Catholic Church is universally in the affirmative. When CHRIST said to Peter, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,"<sup>a</sup> it has been understood that His words extended to all those who hold Peter's place in binding and loosing, "who in faith and manners hold the place of holy regiment."<sup>e</sup> And accordingly the sacred words have been constantly repeated in the form of delivering the Ministerial commission to the Priests of the Church. "We undoubtingly believe," says Gennadius, "that sins are abolished by penitence, even though a man repent of what he hath done at the last breath of life and his sins be discovered by public lamenting; because the purpose of GOD, whereby He hath decreed to save that which had perished, stands immoveable: and therefore since His purpose is not changed either by

<sup>a</sup> S. Matt. xvi. 19; S. John xx. 23.

<sup>e</sup> S. Greg. Magn. Dialogg. L. ii. c. 23, Opp. T. III. p. 269.

amendment of life (if time is granted) or by suppliant confession (if the person forthwith departs this life,) pardon of sins may be faithfully presumed of Him, Who willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he may be converted from perdition by repenting, and being saved by the mercy of the LORD may live. If any one thinks otherwise of the most just pity of GOD, he is not a Christian but a Novatianist.”<sup>f</sup> But, as Thorndike warns us, this judgment of Gennadius is “a presumption of what may be, not a warrant of what is,” which the power of the keys regularly used promises. (*Of the Laws of the Church*, c. X. §. 10. Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 222.) Nor is Absolution from sin barely procured by the priest, but, as Firmilian saith, Penance is enjoined that the sinner may so be converted to understand his sins, and be constrained to make fuller satisfaction to GOD. (*Epp. S. Cypriani*, Ep. 75.) And though, when men cannot feel sure that of themselves they will betake them to the cure of sins by the proper means, they are bound in conscience to have recourse to the keys of the Church, yet it hath hapt that the more trust was reposed in the power of the Church, the less provision was made for that disposition of heart which the Gospel requires. (*Thornd.* Vol. IV. Pt. I. pp. 220, 225.)

§. 2. This merciful provision of the Gospel was a subject of derision with the Pagan opponents of the early Church. “You make men to sin, when you promise them pardon upon doing penance,” was their taunt in Augustine’s time.<sup>g</sup> And the one Baptismal cleansing and the one open Penance allowed by the Church are alike coupled with dissoluteness by Julian in his satirical sketch of Constantine.<sup>h</sup> A more serious objection is found in the *prima facie* bearing of S. Paul’s text, which would seem to deny any renovation or recovery to those who fall into deadly sin after Baptism. “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the HOLY GHOST, and have tasted the good word of GOD, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them

Objections  
to it.

<sup>f</sup> De Dogmatib. Eccles. ap. S. Aug. Opp. T. VIII. p. 80. App.

<sup>g</sup> S. Aug. Sermon. 352, Tom. V. p. 1371.

<sup>h</sup> Julian. Imp. Aug. Cæsares, Opp. p. 336, Ed. Spanheim.

again to repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the SON OF GOD afresh, and put Him to an open shame.”<sup>1</sup> The argument seems to be, CHRIST was once for all crucified, once for all died for sin, and therefore there is one, not more baptisms. Why, but that he also above premised ‘the doctrine of baptisms?’<sup>2</sup> And because there were many baptisms in the Law, he teaches that there is One Baptism among the Sacraments of the Church. Seeing then that there can be no iteration of the solemn and complete ‘Remission of sins’ conveyed in that ‘one Baptism’ to such as sincerely undertake the Covenant of Grace, what remaineth but the second plank thrown out to the shipwrecked, even the discipline of Penance and ‘the benefit of Absolution’? And yet that Absolution must always savour of a presumption, seeing it depends on the sincerity of the penitent. The passage above cited is, truly, one of great difficulty. It points out that apostasy from CHRIST in a critical conjuncture is a sin that admits of no such clear solution as the One Baptism supplies. Yet the penitential discipline of the ancient Church proves it was not hopeless.<sup>3</sup>

Of the penitential discipline of the Primitive Church.

§. 3. In the Primitive Church three kinds of mortal sin only were punished by open public Penance, that is, Idolatry, Murder, and Adultery.<sup>1</sup> But it is clear from the Canonical Epistle of S. Basil to Amphilochius, that other mortal sins, such as inordinate lusts, were subjected, with adultery, to exclusion from Communion for fifteen years; while poisoning, together with murder and idolatry, was punished by twenty years’ exclusion. Secret sins mentioned in confession were not to be divulged, but yet the penitent was quietly, that is, without the formality of open denunciation, ordered to abstain from Communion, until the time of penance had expired.<sup>2</sup> This is the more important, as it comes nearest to the practice of the later Church. At the close of the fourth century,

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vi. 4—6.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. vi. 2.

<sup>3</sup> S. Ambros. De Pœnitentia, L. ii. c. 2, §§. 10, 11. T. II. p. 418.

<sup>1</sup> See Natalis Alexander (Hist. Eccles. T. III. p. 637;) and Petavius, (Dogm. Theol. T. IV. De Pœnitentia, L. ii. c. 2, p. 237.) They

rest chiefly on the authority of Tertullian (De Pudicitia, c. 5, p. 558.) and the Council of Illiberis (Canon 2.)

<sup>2</sup> S. Basilii ad Amphiloch. Canon 34, ap. Beveregii Pandectas, T. II. p. 93.

the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397,) ordains, "that a Presbyter may not reconcile a penitent without consulting the Bishop, unless in the Bishop's absence and when necessity compels. But whatsoever penitent's crime is public and most notorious, which the whole Church is acquainted with, let the hand be imposed on him before the *apse*." <sup>n</sup> And the First Council of Toledo (A.D. 400,) limits the performance of public penance to those who have been guilty of scandalous offences: "We call him a Penitent, who, doing public penance under hair-cloth either for homicide or for divers crimes and most grievous sins after baptism, shall have been reconciled to the Divine altar." <sup>o</sup> This public 'godly discipline of penance' was to be performed once only. Thus S. Ambrose: "They are deservedly blamed, who think that penance may be frequently performed; because they wax wanton in CHRIST. For if they truly did penance, they would not think it may be repeated; because, as there is One Baptism, so is there one penance, which yet is publicly done; for we ought to repent of daily sin; but the latter is of lighter transgressions, the former of graver." <sup>p</sup> Nor is it to be wondered at, if the public penance was attended by such circumstances as are described by S. Pacian: "To weep in sight of the Church, to mourn in a sordid dress his lost life, to fast, to pray, to prostrate himself; if anyone calls him to the bath, to refuse pleasures; if any one invites him to an entertainment, to say, 'Those things are for the happy, I have sinned against the LORD and am in danger of perishing eternally; what are banquets to me, who have offended the LORD?' To grasp moreover the hands of the poor, to implore widows, to kneel before the Presbyters, to deprecate the Church as a successful pleader, to try everything sooner than perish." <sup>q</sup> So strict was the discipline of the early Church, that it was held wrong to enter military service or even contract marriage after public penance, to say nothing of positive sins. In the case

<sup>n</sup> 'Ante absidem.' Conc. Carth. III. Canon 32, *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1171.

<sup>o</sup> Gratian. Decret. I. Dist. 50, c. 68. Conc. Toletan. I. Canon 2, *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1223.

<sup>p</sup> S. Amb. De Pœnitentia, L. ii. c. 10. T. II. p. 436.

<sup>q</sup> S. Pacianus Barcinonensis Episcopus, Parœnesis ad Pœnitentiam, *ap.* Bibliothecam Max. P.P. Tom. IV. p. 317.

of persons who had so acted, Pope Siricius (A.D. 385) writes; "Since they may no longer escape doing penance, we have thought it should be decided, that in church they should join the faithful in prayer only; that, although they do not deserve it, they may be present at the sacred celebration of the Mysteries; but that they should be separated from the feast of the LORD's Table; that, being rebuked by this strictness at least, they may both themselves chastise their errors and set an example to others, to the end they be drawn back from evil desires. To whom however (since they have fallen by carnal frailty) we will that aid be given by the grace of Communion, when they begin to depart to the LORD."<sup>\*</sup>

Reasons for  
introducing  
Auricular,  
Confession  
and Private  
Penance.

§. 4. With regard to Confession, it may be remarked that the public *exomologesis* before the congregation became almost impossible, when the world at large had become Christian. S. Leo gives the reason thus: "Although the fulness of faith may seem praiseworthy, which for the fear of GOD is not afraid to blush before men; yet since all men's sins are not such as they may not fear to publish, let so reprehensible a custom (as publishing them) be removed, lest many be driven away from the remedies of penance, while they either blush or fear that their deeds may be disclosed to their enemies, for which they may be smitten by the laws. For that confession is sufficient, which is first offered to GOD, then also to the Priest (or Bishop, '*sacerdoti*,') who approaches to pray for the sins of the penitents. So at last shall more be provoked to penance, if the conscience of the person confessing be not published to the ears of the people."<sup>\*</sup> So sacred was the knowledge thus obtained in private confession held, that at the Seventh Council of Carthage (A.D. 419,) at which S. Augustine assisted, it was decreed, that if a Bishop refused to communicate with a person who chose to deny his having confessed what the said bishop divulged, communion should be withheld from the same Bishop by his brethren, to teach him caution for the future.<sup>†</sup> Enforced Confession, to avoid civil

<sup>\*</sup> Siricii P.P. Epist. i. ad Himerium Tarraconensem, *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1019.

<sup>\*</sup> S. Leo P.P. I. Epist. 80, *ap.* Labbe. T. III. p. 1374.

<sup>†</sup> Conc. Carthag. VII. Canon 5, *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1604.

disabilities, as in Sweden, is an offensive survival. Practised as in the Anglican Church, without due safeguards of *knowledge* or of penalties attaching to its *betrayal*, the benefit is imperilled. Such a passage, as Mark Pattison records in his 'Memoirs,' p. 189, should be impossible. The Koran attributes the institution of Confession to the counsels of S. Peter (*Bouthroux*), whom it regards with animosity; proof, I take it, of the antiquity of the practice and of the silent recognition of S. Peter's Primacy even in the East. It suggests that the design of Confession is to enable the priest to profit by his knowledge of a man's passions or his home-life. (p. 104.)

This is a warning, though it proceeds from a foe. Such a penalty as that above proposed would not be felt in a Church not similarly circumstanced as the African. Public Confession did not at once cease; for as late as A.D. 517, we find Pope Hormisdas thus declaring against the eligibility of one who had been a penitent to the Episcopal office: "With what conscience may he absolve a guilty person, who knows that he himself hath confessed his sins, and the people witness to it? For who may venerate him as bishop, whom a short while ago he hath seen prostrate? Bearing before him the stain of his pitiable crime, he bears not the dignity of the priesthood unspotted."\*

§. 5. "Let a man then judge himself willingly in these things," says S. Augustine, "while he may, and amend his manners; lest he be judged of the LORD even beside his will. And when he shall have passed against himself a sentence of most severe medicine, let him come to the Bishops, by whom the keys are ministered in the Church; and now beginning to be as it were a good son, let him receive from those that administer the Sacraments the manner of his satisfaction: that, devout and suppliant in offering the sacrifice of a troubled heart, he may yet do that which may not only profit himself to salvation but also others for example. If his sin be a great scandal to others, and it seem to the Bishop to be expedient to the interest of the Church, let him not refuse to do penance in the knowledge of many or even of the whole people; let him not by a feeling of shame add irritation to

Confession  
and Penance  
recommended by  
S. August-  
tine.

\* Hormisdas P.P. Epist. 25, *ap.* Labbe. T. IV. p. 1467.



his deadly wound.”\* “Let no one suppose that he ought therefore to despise the counsel of this salutary penance, because perchance he knows that many approach the Sacrament of the Altar, whose special crimes he is not ignorant of. For many are corrected, as Peter; many are tolerated, as Judas; many are not known, until the LORD come, Who will illuminate the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the thoughts of the heart. For most persons are on that account unwilling to accuse others, while they wish by their means to excuse themselves. But most good Christians are for this reason silent and suffer the sins of others, because they often lack evidence and are unable to prove to ecclesiastical judges that which they themselves know. For although some things be true, yet they are not to be easily disclosed to the judge, unless certainly proved. But we cannot hinder any one from Communion, (although this prohibition be not yet mortal but medicinal,) unless either one that hath of his own accord confessed, or that has been convicted in some secular or ecclesiastical judgment.” †

Of the loss  
of Discipline  
in England.

§. 6. They of the Reformation, dissatisfied with the working of Auricular Confession and with abuses dating from the Crusades and the powers granted to the Mendicant Orders, aimed at restoration of Public Penance; and the futility of the design is to this day witnessed by the annual expression of a fruitless wish in our Communion Service. S. Leo, quoted above, teaches us why such a design must needs miscarry. Thorndike remarks with pain, how a Church where the power of the keys is in abeyance “is a Church in hope and right rather than in deed.” (*Just Weights*, c. XXIV. § 10.)

Yet if the Church hath on grave occasions forborne the use of the keys to maintain unity; if the Church of Rome in Mary I.'s days could reconcile the English nation without exacting restitution of church plunder, that is, *absolve impenitents*, the moral force of the discipline of Penance is grievously impaired; and the impossibility of restoring ancient severity proved, leaving matters to be amended in GOD's good time.

\* S. Aug. Serm. 351, De Pœnitentia, §. 9. Tom. V. p. 1359.

† De Pœnitentia, §. 10. See also

S. Augustin. Contra Epist. Parmeniani, lib. iii. §. 14. Tom. IX. p. 64.

## CHAPTER XXIX.

## OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY AND HIERARCHY.

§. 1. WHEN we inquire into the organization bequeathed by the Apostles to the Church Catholic to administer the permanent legacy of the Word and Sacraments, we find ourselves perplexed by the contradictions of modern controversy. If we turn to Scripture, S. Paul tells us, that CHRIST, "when He ascended up on high, \* gave gifts," *charismata*, of a supernatural character, "to men. And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of CHRIST."† But some of these Divinely ordained functions were not of a permanent character, as, for example, those of Evangelists and Prophets. The one gathered in fresh sheaves into the LORD's garner; the other interpreted the utterances of the unknown tongues.‡ We do not find that any successors were provided for Agabus and the early Prophets; but the work of the Evangelists would be soon merged by the growth of the Church in that of the Pastors and Doctors. Accordingly when S. Paul's time of departure was at hand, we find that he left Titus in Crete to "ordain elders," that is, Presbyters, "in every city;"§ and he provided for a future succession of Pastors, when he charged Timothy to "commit" "the form of sound words" "to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."¶ It is clear from Scripture that these *vicars*, delegates, or successors of the Apostles were in

Of the  
Apostolical  
origin of  
the Hier-  
archy.

\* Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12.

† 1 Cor. xiv. 13, 27—31.

‡ Titus i. 5.

§ 2 Tim. ii. 2, i. 13.

the first century called indiscriminately 'Apostles,' and by a corresponding term 'Angels,' 'Bishops,' and 'Presbyters.'<sup>b</sup> The question is, when the further distinction of Bishops with jurisdiction over the college of Presbyters took place? Did the Episcopate, as afterwards universally known in the Church, spring out of the Presbyterate; or was it an integral power which was, as time wore on, parcelled out and subdivided into minor spheres of action, reserving a controlling power lodged in the hands of the representatives of the primary missionaries or Apostles? Was that constitution of diocesan Episcopacy of Apostolical and (if so) Divine institution, and doth it come down to later times with the force of an inalienable and indefeasible right? I believe that no ingenuity can resolve, whether those persons whom S. Paul summoned from Ephesus to Miletus, whom S. Luke styles Presbyters (or elders), but whom S. Paul saith "the HOLY GHOST had made Bishops (or overseers),"<sup>c</sup> were Bishops acting as a college, or Presbyters in the modern sense. But the fact of Timothy's having been left at Ephesus with jurisdiction over the elders,<sup>d</sup> inclines me to the belief that their commission did not exceed that of Presbyters. The cases of Timothy and Titus having been left by S. Paul at Ephesus and in Crete with full powers "to set in order the things that are wanting,"<sup>e</sup> are much insisted on by the defenders of Episcopacy; but the very largeness of those powers and the privileges of Apostolical men would seem to render them superior to diocesan Bishops. But the Apocalypse represents the Seven Churches as identified with their 'angels' in so remarkable a manner, that, unless we imagine those Churches not to have outgrown their infant state, (an impossibility at the close of the first century), we must confess that S. John could not have hit on a mode of communication with those Churches more in accordance with the practice, which is found universal in the second century. The Angels are there held responsible for the condition of the communities over which they preside, just as the Bishops of

<sup>b</sup> Acts xv. 6, xx. 17, 28, 2 Cor. x. 23, Phil. ii. 25, 1 S. Peter v. 1, Rev. ii.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xx. 28.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19.

<sup>e</sup> Titus i. 5.

succeeding times are the centres and life of their respective Churches. It would seem that, as the first Apostles were being withdrawn from their labours, the power of governing the Church was confided to one of the Presbyters with Apostolical sanction, as a remedy against the growing schisms of the Church ; and that this system was in full operation before the death of the Beloved Disciple.

Fortunately we have the testimony of Clement, S. Paul's fellow-labourer,<sup>f</sup> on record ; so that this is not a mere supposition. He writes thus : "Preaching then in country places and cities, they (the Apostles) appointed their first-fruits, having tested them, for Bishops and Deacons of those that should believe. \* And our Apostles knew through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, that there would be strife about the name of the Episcopate. For this cause then, having received perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and meanwhile gave charge, that, if they fell asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry." \* S. Irenæus, the disciple of S. Polycarp the hearer of S. John, writes as if Bishops and Presbyters were one and the same ; but the great point was the succession from the Apostles. Secure *that*, and you have all that is wanted. He says ; "Wherefore we ought to hearken to those Presbyters who are in the Church and have the succession from the Apostles, as we have shown ; who, together with the succession of the Episcopate, have according to the FATHER'S good pleasure received the certain gift of Truth." <sup>h</sup> S. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the threefold Ministry, being an established fact in his time, as an imitation of the heavenly Hierarchy ; but he states nothing categorically of the origin of the Episcopate. His words are ; "Since also the advancements here in the Church, of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, are, I imagine, imitations of angelical glory and of that dispensation, which the Scriptures say awaits those that have lived in the footsteps of the Apostles in the perfecting of righteousness according to the Gospel." <sup>i</sup> S. Cyprian applies the text, "He that heareth you

<sup>f</sup> Phil. iv. 3.

<sup>h</sup> S. Iren. Adv. Hæreses, L. iv.

\* S. Clemens Romanus, Epist. c. 43, p. 381.

<sup>i</sup> Strom. L. vi. p. 481.

ad Corinth. capp. 42, 44.

heareth Me,"<sup>j</sup> to the Apostles, "and hereby to all Presidents, who succeed to the Apostles by vicarious ordination : " <sup>k</sup> but this proves nothing as to any Divine right of Episcopacy beyond an assertion of the connection of the then governors of the Church with the Apostles by a continuous ordination. More express is the statement of one of Cyprian's suffragans, Clarus of Mascula, who says that they, that is, the Bishops, had succeeded to the Apostles, "with the same power governing the Church of the LORD and baptizing the faith of the believers."<sup>l</sup> Cyprian says elsewhere : "Thence," that is, from S. Peter, "through the changes of times and successions the ordination of Bishops and the account of the Church comes down, that it be constituted on the Bishops, and every act thereof be governed by the same."<sup>m</sup>

The lower  
Theory re-  
specting it.

§.2. On the other hand, a tradition assigning a lower origin to Episcopacy is distinctly traceable in antiquity. Tertullian says, "The authority of the Church hath constituted the difference between the Clergy and People."<sup>n</sup> S. Jerome, as is well known, is unfavourable to the high view of Episcopacy. "I hear," he says, "that some one has broken out into such folly as to prefer Deacons to Priests, that is, Bishops? For when the Apostle clearly teaches that Presbyters are the same as Bishops, what ails the minister of tables and widows that he swells out and bears himself above those, at whose prayers the Body and Blood of CHRIST are made? \* But that afterwards one was elected to be set above the rest, it was done to remedy schism; lest every one drawing to himself the Church of CHRIST should break it. For also at Alexandria from Mark the Evangelist down to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius the presbyters always named Bishop one chosen out of themselves and placed in a higher grade; as if the army were to make an Emperor, or the Deacons were to choose of themselves one whom they knew to be industrious and call him Archdeacon. For what doth a Bishop, except ordaining, that a Presbyter may not do?"<sup>o</sup> S. Isidore of

<sup>j</sup> S. Luke x. 16.

<sup>k</sup> S. Cyp. Ep. 66, Tom. II. p. 167.

<sup>l</sup> Conc. Carth. *ap.* S. Cyprian. T. I. p. 242.

<sup>m</sup> S. Cyp. Ep. 33, T. II. p. 66.

<sup>n</sup> *Ordinem et Plebem.* Tert. De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. 7, p. 522.

<sup>o</sup> S. Hieron. Ep. 146 ad Evangelum (85 ad Evagrium).

Seville follows Jerome and says ; " But the ordination of Clerks has been reserved to the Chief Priest (or Bishop) only for the sake of authority, lest the discipline of the Church being claimed by many should undo concord and breed scandals." <sup>p</sup> Jerome pertinently applies the fact, which he so strongly assumes, thus ; " Let the Bishops know, that they are greater than Presbyters by custom rather than by the LORD's real disposition, and that they ought to rule the Church in common ; imitating Moses, who, when he had alone to preside over the people of Israel, chose the seventy with whom he might judge the people." <sup>a</sup> This notion continued through the Middle Ages, as we find Panormitan writing ; " Although touching the Sacrament of the Eucharist the LORD disposed who should have to administer it ; yet this was not disposed in the conferring of orders ; for of old Presbyters ruled the Church in common, and ordained Priests." <sup>r</sup> Lancelotti embodies this view in the Canon Law. " There are who affirm that the Presbyter and the Bishop were originally the same person, and that the one was a name of age, the other of dignity. But when many Presbyters were constituted in every Church, for a remedy of schism, it came to pass that one was chosen by them to be set above the rest ; but that the person elected retained the name of Bishop. the electors that of Presbyters ; whose respect towards the Bishops grew to that degree, that as sons they began to obey them ; nor are they now held as Priests, who are not governed under some Bishop's discipline and providence." <sup>s</sup>

§. 3. But whichever may be the (historically) correct view, morally the Episcopate was felt to be the bond of union, which permeated the whole body of the Catholic Church wheresoever it existed. Thus S. Cyprian : " There is one God, and one CHRIST, and one Church, and one Chair founded on Peter by the LORD's voice. There cannot be another altar set up or a new priesthood made beside one Altar and one Priesthood. Whosoever gathers a congregation else-

The Episcopate, the bond of external unity.

<sup>p</sup> S. Isidorus Hispalensis, De Officiis Eccles. L. ii. capp. 5, 7.

<sup>a</sup> S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Titum.

<sup>r</sup> Panorm. *super* i. part. Primi Decret. p. 95.

<sup>s</sup> Lancelotti Instt. Juris Canon. L. i. tit. 21, §. 3

where scattereth.”<sup>†</sup> “There is one Episcopate, whereof a portion is held by each individual as equivalent to the whole.”<sup>‡</sup> It followed from this unity that each Bishop felt an interest in the general welfare of the whole body, even beyond the portion entrusted to his own special supervision : “for it becomes us all,” says S. Cyprian, “to watch for the body of the whole Church, whose members are disposed throughout the various particular provinces.”<sup>§</sup> And the high terms applied to the Sacerdotal Order as a “mediation” or intervention “between GOD and men,”<sup>¶</sup> and as “vicars of CHRIST,”<sup>\*\*</sup> force upon us the conviction, that it was no mere matter of Church arrangement that could draw forth such expressions. ‘Ye, O Bishops,’ say the Apostolical Constitutions, “are to your people at the present day Priests, Levites that serve the sacred tabernacle the Holy Catholic Church, and stand at the altar of the LORD our GOD, and offer to Him the reasonable and unbloody Sacrifices through JESUS the Great High Priest. Ye are to the laymen among you, prophets, princes, chiefs, and kings, the mediators between GOD and His faithful, the receivers and announcers of the Word, they that know the Scriptures, and the voices of GOD and witnesses of his will, they that bear the sins of all and answer for all ; whom the Word severely threatens, if ye hide from men the key of knowledge ; to whom is fatal danger, if ye declare not His will to the people under your charge ; whose reward with GOD is certain and glory inexpressible, when ye have well served His Holy Tabernacle.”<sup>††</sup>

The three-  
fold Sacred  
Ministry.

§. 4. From the first age downwards the *sacred Orders* of the Ministry have been reckoned as *three*, Bishops, Priests, Deacons ; although the inferior officers of the Church were ranked among the Clergy. Thus Optatus in the fourth century reproaches the Donatists ; “Ye found believers of long standing, ye made them, (that is, degraded them to the rank of) penitents : ye found Deacons, Priests, Bishops, ye made them

<sup>†</sup> Ep 43, T. II. p. 83.

<sup>‡</sup> De Unitate Ecclesie, T. I. p. 108.

<sup>§</sup> Ep. 36, T. II. p. 71.

<sup>¶</sup> Epist. Ægyptiorum Episcop.

ad Leonem Augustum, *ap. Labbe*, T. IV. p. 894.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Hormisdas P.P. I. Ep. 25. *Ibid.* T. IV. p. 1467.

<sup>††</sup> Apost. Constitt. L. ii. c. 25, *ap. Labbe*, T. I. p. 260.

laymen. \* Whereas there are four kinds of classes in the Church, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Faithful, ye would not spare even one."† Isidore of Seville reckons *nine* Orders in the Christian Ministry, probably in imitation of the nine orders of Angels. "Generally," he says, "all are styled Clerics, who serve in the Church of CHRIST, whose degrees and names are these; Ostiary, Psalmist, Reader, Exorcist, Acolyte, Subdeacon, Deacon, Priest, Bishop. The order of Bishop is fourfold, consisting of Patriarchs, Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Bishops."‡ Lombard in the twelfth century drops the order of Psalmist, and counts the orders of Bishop and Priest as one, in order to make the number *seven*, to match the seven gifts of the SPIRIT. By this arrangement he leaves the place of High Priest open to the Roman Pontiff; whereas Isidore classes him with the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria as equally *Apostolici* or holding the place of Apostles in the Church. Isidore's classification of Bishops is remarkable, in that he merges the Pope among the Patriarchs; while his contemporary Gregory the Great seems to make the Primacy of S. Peter an heritage unequally shared by Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. When the growth of the Church no longer allowed the correspondence of bishops to serve the purpose of preserving so great a body in unity, the pre-eminence of Rome in the West and the aggrandizement of Constantinople were the natural consequences. The principle of Unity condemns all unnecessary violations of the ancient order of the Catholic Church. "The Canons," saith Lombard, "deem that two only should be styled Sacred Orders by way of excellence, to wit, the Diaconate and the Priesthood; because the Primitive Church had these only, and concerning these alone have we the Apostle's injunction."§

§. 5. We now inquire, what rights were reserved to the great body of the Faithful, the Laity; when the powers of government were so fully vested in the Bishops and Clergy? The records, which supply us with *data* on this head, are indeed scanty; but it may be assumed that the Laity were

Of the Ecclesiastical rights of the Laity.

\* S. Opt. Milev. L. ii. p. 59. Cf. L. vii. c. 12.  
L. i. p. 39.

† Lombard. Sent. L. iv. Dist. 24, p. 828.

‡ S. Isidor. Hispal. Etymolog. p. 828.



consulted more or less formally, when matters, affecting their interests, were to be discussed in Synod. Thus S. Cyprian says, that in so grave an affair as that of restoring Communion to the lapsed it was to be handled with caution and moderation, "all the Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Confessors, and the standing laymen themselves (that is, such as had not lapsed and therefore stood in the public service of the Church, Penitents being prostrate) having been consulted."° S. Leo writes; "When in God's Name we had held in the Roman Church a united synod of Bishops or the rest of our fellow-Priests and of CHRIST's Faithful."ª In the Synod of Constantinople under Flavian, we find the Patrician Florentius admitted to be present at the instance of the Emperor; the reason alleged being, "inasmuch as the argument concerns the faith."• In the Synod of Tarragona, A.D. 516, the Bishops are told to convene to synod not only priests from cathedral churches but also from the diocesan, and "to bring with them some of the secular sons of the Church."† And it became customary in the rude infancy of Modern Europe to substitute the nobles for the general body of the laity, in accordance with the prevailing tone of feudal institutions; and at the Second Council of Orange, A.D. 529, certain illustrious persons even subscribe the doctrinal definitions of the Synod, because they were intended as "a healing, not only to persons professing religion, but also to laymen."§

Growth of  
Imperial  
power in the  
Church.

§. 6. If the rights of the religious Laity passed into the hands of the aristocracy, as the Germanic feudal idea prevailed, it was inevitable that under the despotic autocracy of the Roman Emperors the civil sovereign should absorb into his own person the ecclesiastical rights of his lay subjects. "Know," says the Emperor Theodosius the Second, "that both the churches and the empire are united, and will at our bidding be yet more united, by the providence of GOD our

° Ep. 31, T. II. p. 63.

ª Ep. 88, *ap.* Labbe, T. III. p. 1395.

• *ἑπειδὴ λόγος περὶ πίστεως ἐστίν.*  
Conc. Chalcedon. Action. I. *ap.*  
Labbe, T. IV. p. 220. Cf. Socrates,

Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. c. 8, p. 20, Ed. Valesii.

† Conc. Tarraconensis, Canon 13, *ap.* Labbe, T. IV. p. 1565.

§ Labbe, T. IV. p. 1672.

SAVIOUR.”<sup>h</sup> And he adds as the reason ; “ Since it is impossible that he that has to do with the one should not mind the other also, we study above all that the state of the Church may continue agreeable to GOD and suitable to our times.”<sup>i</sup> S. Leo utters what modern States rarely admit ; “ Human affairs cannot otherwise be safe, unless both the imperial and sacerdotal authority defends what pertains to the Divine confession.”<sup>j</sup> But it was to preserve concord between the Hierarchy and the secular powers that the former gladly invoked the aid of the Sovereign “ as a principal son of our sacred religion ; ”<sup>k</sup> certainly not with any intention of abdicating their right of independent jurisdiction. For, as Pope Gelasius writes to the Emperor Zeno, “ there are two things whereby this world is chiefly ruled, the sacred authority of chief priests and the regal power. Wherein so much the graver is the weight of the Bishops, as they are to render to the LORD in the Divine judgment an account even for Kings themselves. For you know, most clement son, that, although in dignity you preside over mankind, yet you devoutly bend your neck to the prelates in divine things, and seek from them the occasions of your salvation, and in taking the heavenly Sacraments and disposing them (as is meet) you know that in the order of religion you should be subject rather than preside.”<sup>l</sup> If these ancient Fathers could have foreseen, that under pretence of *reforming*, that is, restoring decayed Christianity, an attempt would be made “ to reduce the whole jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts under that of the laws of the land,” (Thornd. *Works*, Vol. V. p. 447,) they would assuredly have said “ it was not the reforming, but the deforming of the Church.” (Ib. *Just Weights*, c. XVI. §. 10.) Herein the whole Western Church appears to me committed to transgression of the fundamental provisions of the Catholic Church. The revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction by Francis I. in France, (annulling all freedom of Election of Bishops,) matches the arbitrary acts of our Henry VIII.

<sup>h</sup> Conc. Ephes. Pt. I. c. 31, *ap.*  
Labbe, T. III. p. 435.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* p. 438.

<sup>j</sup> S. Leo, Ep. 31, *ibid.* p. 1311.

<sup>k</sup> Felix P.P. III. Ep. 15, *ap.*  
Labbe, T. IV. p. 1093.

<sup>l</sup> Gelasius P.P. I. Ep. 8, *ap.*  
Labbe, T. IV. p. 1182.

## CHAPTER XXX.

OF THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, AND THE COMMUNION OF  
SAINTS.

Of the In-  
termediate  
State of the  
Dead.

§. 1. WHEN we come to consider what is revealed in Scripture of the state of departed souls between death and the resurrection, we shall find very gradual and imperfect disclosures, and even the amount actually disclosed mixed up in popular apprehension with much of poetical conjecture. In the Book of Genesis God foretold to Abraham, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace;"<sup>m</sup> and the usual expression concerning the deceased Patriarchs is, that they were "gathered to their people."<sup>n</sup> But this does not prove more than that their bodies were laid in the same resting-place, as in the cave of Machpelah.<sup>o</sup> The first occurrence of a hint of the dread future is Jacob's lament, "For I will go down into *the grave*," or into SHEOL or Hades, "unto my son mourning."<sup>p</sup> The Patriarchs are represented as looking forward to it with a sense of dismay. Scarcely a ray of hope seems to relieve the gloom. Job speaks of it as something to be preferred to the positive misery of his existence upon earth; "There the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary be at rest."<sup>q</sup> But he shrinks from the uncertain advantage; "Let me alone that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness."<sup>r</sup> In the Psalms it is said; "The dead

<sup>m</sup> Gen. xv. 15.

<sup>n</sup> xxv. 8, xxxv. 29, xlix. 33.

<sup>o</sup> v. 31.

<sup>p</sup> xxxvii. 35.

<sup>q</sup> Job iii. 17.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* x. 20—22.

praise not the LORD, neither any that go down into silence." \* Solomon says ; "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward ; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished ; neither have they any more a portion in anything that is done under the sun." † And Hezekiah mourns that "the grave cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee : they that go down into the pit cannot hope for Thy truth." ‡

But the facts of the translation of Enoch and Elijah into some unknown state of happiness, the brighter hopes of the Evangelical Prophet, § the wondrous vision of Ezekiel touching the resurrection of dry bones, ¶ and the promise made to Daniel, \* must have furnished the Jewish Church with the key to what had previously been suggested rather than expressed. And so we find the Author of the book of Wisdom asserting ; "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise, they seemed to die : and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction : but they are in peace." † Josephus says of the Pharisees ; "Their belief is that souls have an undying strength, and judgments and honours under ground await them who in life have pursued virtue or vice ; and that to some is allotted eternal confinement, to others a faculty of coming to life again." ‡ While the Essenes "entertaining a similar opinion with the sons of the Greeks, assert that for good souls is reserved a life beyond the ocean, and a place incommoded neither by showers nor by snow-storms nor by heats, but which the mild zephyr blowing from off the ocean ever refreshes ; but for wicked souls they set apart a dark and chilly cavity, full of unceasing torments." §

According to Lightfoot, the Jewish schools describe the receptacle of pious souls after death under three names, the Garden of Eden, the Throne of Glory, and Abraham's Bosom. †

\* Ps. cxv. 17.

† Eccles. ix. 5, 6.

‡ Isa. xxxviii. 18.

§ Ib. xxvi. 19.

¶ Ezek. xxxvii. 1, &c.

\* Dan. xii. 13.

† Wisd. iii. 1—3.

‡ De Antiquit. Judaic. Lib. xviii. c. 1, §. 3, Opp. Tom. II. p. 793.

§ Id. De Bello Jud. Lib. ii. c. 8,

§. 11, Tom. II. p. 1064.

† Horæ Hebraicæ, p. 851.

And we find that our LORD and His Apostles have either sanctioned the use of those terms as adequate representations of the ideas which they stand for, or at all events have allowed them to pass current as symbolical formulæ for what "eye hath not seen nor ear heard neither hath entered into the heart of man."<sup>c</sup> Our LORD Himself allowed the first, when He said to the penitent thief, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise;"<sup>d</sup> using the Septuagint rendering of the Garden of Eden. And S. Paul saith of himself, "that he was caught up into Paradise."<sup>e</sup> The second term may be implied, when S. John saith that he "saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God:"<sup>f</sup> for the altar was the seat of GOD's glory or the Shekinah. The third term is employed by our LORD in the parable of the rich man and the beggar.<sup>g</sup> The notion it conveys is that of felicity and repose, as of happy and honoured guests at a sumptuous and regal banquet, gathered under the auspices of the Father of the Faithful and the Friend of God. It is known to the Author of the book of Esdras; "Behold the number of those that be sealed for the feast of the LORD; which are departed from the shadow of the world, and have received glorious garments of the LORD."<sup>h</sup> It is alluded to by CHRIST, saying, "That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven."<sup>i</sup> And again in the Apocalypse; "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the LAMB."<sup>j</sup>

The speculations of the Primitive Church on this subject may be given in Tertullian's words; but I would premise that that is no wise or cautious theory which undertakes to map out the secrets of things invisible; and, because time and place are necessary conditions to our present exercise of thought, assumes boldly the real existence of those conventional *media* by which alone we take cognizance of things beyond our experience. "It appears," he says, "to any wise

<sup>c</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 9.

<sup>d</sup> S. Luke xxiii. 43.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Rev. vi. 9.

<sup>g</sup> S. Luke xvi. 22.

<sup>h</sup> 2 Esdr. ii. 38, 39.

<sup>i</sup> S. Matt. viii. 11.

<sup>j</sup> Rev. xix. 9.

man who has ever heard of the Elysian fields, that there is some local determination, which is called Abraham's Bosom, to receive the souls of his sons, even of the Gentiles. \* That region then, although not heavenly, yet higher than hell, shall meanwhile afford refreshment to the souls of the righteous, until the consummation of things fulfil the resurrection of all by the fulness of reward." \* The Author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox says of the souls of the saints, who rose at our LORD's resurrection; "They died not again, but remain in immortality, like Enoch and Elias, and are with them in Paradise, awaiting the external change of CHRIST's Resurrection, that already takes place, according to which we shall all be changed, as the Apostle saith."<sup>1</sup> The Liturgies bear out this language. For example, the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil prays for the departed, that God would grant them "rest in the bosom of holy Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and bring them into a green place by the waters of comfort, into the Paradise of pleasure, into the place whence flee away heart-pain, sorrow, and sighings, in the light of Thy Saints."<sup>m</sup> The Jacobite Liturgy of S. Clement of Rome prays; "Grant to them the spirit of joy in the habitations of light and gladness, \* \* where the souls of the pious without labour look for the first-fruits of life, and the spirits of the righteous alike await the promised reward; in that region, where the workmen and the weary look to Paradise, and invited to the wedding long for the heavenly bridegroom; where being called to the banquet they wait to go up higher, and ardently desire to receive the new robe of glory."<sup>n</sup> S. Gregory Nyssen says of Placilla; "By this faith was she brought to the bosom of Abraham the father of faith, beside the fountain of Paradise, under the shade of the tree of life that is planted by the water side."<sup>o</sup>

\* Tert. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. c. 34, p. 450.

<sup>1</sup> *Ad calcem* S. Justini M. Opp. p. 444, qu. 85.

<sup>m</sup> Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. T. I. p. 18.

<sup>n</sup> Renaudot. Tom. II. p. 196.

<sup>o</sup> *Oratio funebris de Placilla*, Opp. T. I. p. 965 Nyssen elsewhere tries to make out the term

'Abraham's Bosom,' *ὁ κόλπος τοῦ Ἀβραάμ*, to be a metaphor borrowed from the notion of the soul's anchoring in a safe and secluded bay after encountering 'the waves of this troublesome world.' (*De Anima et Resurrectione*, T. I. p. 651.) So in the Gallican Sacramentary, it is termed 'the haven of eternal rest.' (*Mabillon. Mus. Ital. T. I. p. 385.*)

S. Gregory the Great writes of the souls of the perfect, that "as soon as they have gone forth out of the enclosures of the flesh, they are received in the kingdom of heaven; which the Truth Itself witnesseth, saying, 'Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together;' since, where our Redeemer Himself is in the body, there no doubt are gathered together the souls of the righteous. And Paul: 'I desire to depart and to be with CHRIST.'<sup>a</sup> He then who doubts not that CHRIST is in heaven denies not that Paul's soul too is in heaven." "If then," says his querist, "*the souls of the righteous are now in heaven*, what is it that they shall receive in the day of judgment for the reward of their righteousness?" "This doubtless accrues to them in the judgment, that now they enjoy the bliss of souls only, but afterwards of their bodies also; that they may rejoice in the flesh itself too, *wherein they bore pains and torments for their Lord*. Inasmuch as in reference to this their doubled glory it is written, 'Therefore in their land they shall possess the double.'<sup>r</sup> Hence also before the day of the resurrection it is written of the souls of the saints; 'And white robes were given unto every one of them: and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.'"<sup>s</sup> It will be seen that S. Gregory speaks of the souls of Martyrs and Confessors, not of Christians dying in a state of grace. Thorndike's chapters on the subject (*Of the Laws of the Church*, capp. XXVII.-XXIX.) merit the closest study. See the end of this chapter. But I cannot grant him, that 'the court of the temple in heaven' is one of Esdras's 'secret storehouses.' (c. XXIX. §. 44.) S. Bernard's

<sup>a</sup> S. Luke xvii. 37.

<sup>r</sup> Phil. i. 23.

<sup>s</sup> Isaiah lxi. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Rev. vi. 11.—S. Greg. Magn. P.P. I. Dial. L. iv. c. 25, p. 326. Cf. Gennad. De Dogm. Eccles. c. 46, ap. S. Aug. Opp. T. VIII. App. p. 80.—I should infer that Eusebius applied the term 'Abraham's Bosom' to Heaven. (Præparat. Evangelic. L. xiii. c. 10, p. 662.) "Σὺ δὲ ἡμῖν οὐρανὸς ἐμβάτειος, καὶ

ἐν κόλποις Ἀβραὰμ οἱ τινες δὲ οὕτως εἰσιν ἀναπαύσαιο. (S. Greg. Nazianzen, Orat. x. T. I. p. 170.) "Mayest thou mount the skies, and rest in Abraham's bosom, whatsoever it be!" So also the Anglican Church does not consider it inconsistent to speak of "those heavenly mansions, where the souls of them that sleep in the LORD JESUS enjoy perpetual rest and felicity." (Office of Visitation of the Sick.)

view in Serm. III. *In festo Omnium Sanctor.* and S. Methodius's (below §. 8,) are profound.

§. 2. The universal practice of the Ancient Church in praying for the dead is so intimately connected with this whole subject, that it cannot fairly be overlooked. The custom had its origin in the rites of the Jewish Synagogue before our LORD's time, which have been transmitted to later ages. It was known to the Maccabees, as it is recorded of Judas Maccabæus, that he sent a sum of two thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering for the sins of those who were slain in battle; "doing therein," says the Author of the Second Book of Maccabees, "very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection: for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly, it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin."\* On this Augustine remarks: "We read in the books of the Maccabees that sacrifice was offered for the dead. But even if it were nowhere at all read in the Old Scriptures, the authority of the Universal Church, which in this custom is clear, is not slight; where in the prayers of the Priest, which are poured to the LORD GOD at His altar, the commendation of the dead also hath its place."† Here as elsewhere the retention of the practice is justified on the ground of its being a part and parcel of Catholic Tradition, and the Arians are classed as heretics for that reason; while the Fathers, when they attempt to argue apart from usage, betray the *ex post facto* character of their reasoning. S. Epiphanius asks; "And then about mentioning the names of the departed, what can be more useful than this? what more seasonable and admirable than that those that are present should believe, that the departed live and are not annihilated, but exist and live with the LORD; and that the most solemn proclamation be made, how there is hope to them that pray for their brethren as absent; and how that the prayer

Of Prayer  
for the Dead.

\* 2 Macc. xii. 43—45.

† De Cura gerenda pro Mortuis,  
§ 3, Tom. VI. p. 516.



will profit them, even if it rescind not the whole of their faults.”<sup>v</sup>

But whatever sublime reasons derived from our common brotherhood in CHRIST and the present imperfection of the mystical Body until “the manifestation of the sons of God,”<sup>w</sup> and “the times of the restitution of all things,”<sup>x</sup> may be pleaded in support of the practice, I think it certain that historically it came into the Christian Church from the Synagogue, as a dictate of natural affection, which suited the mystery that enfolds the condition of the departed; and which might in any case return with a blessing to the bosom of the supplicant in the very exercise of the purest and most disinterested feelings of our nature. Tertullian says, of a widow; “She both prays for his (her late husband’s) soul, and meanwhile begs for refreshment for him and a share in the first resurrection, and offers (sacrifice) on the anniversaries of his sleep.”<sup>y</sup> Leo of Modena says of the Jews, that seven days after the funeral they go to the synagogue, where they cause lamps to be lit and prayers made, and promise alms for the soul of the deceased; which they repeat *at the end of the month* and year.”<sup>z</sup> Hence the *month’s mind* of our Catholic forefathers. Buxtorf tells us, that the whole congregation prays for the dead every Sabbath, especially for those who have either bequeathed anything for the use of the poor or the maintenance of the synagogue, or have deserved well by other works.<sup>a</sup> And in like manner ‘rest’ and ‘fellowship in the

<sup>v</sup> S. Epiphan. adv. Hæres., Hæres. Aërii, 75, Tom. I. p. 911.

<sup>w</sup> Rom. viii. 19.

<sup>x</sup> Acts iii. 21.

<sup>y</sup> Tert. De Monogamia, c. 10, p. 531. *Id.* De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. 11, p. 523.

<sup>z</sup> Ceremonies et Coustumes des Juifs, Chap. ix. §. 5, p. 291.

<sup>a</sup> Synagoga Judaica, cap. 49, p. 710. He gives this form of prayer from the usage of the Italian Jews: “May God remember for good the soul of N., who hath gone to eternal life with the soul of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or (in case of a female) of Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, and Leah, who live in the garden of Eden; inasmuch as N. or N. (his

son or his relative) is about to give, as much as his mind will of its own accord dictate to him, in alms, or for the oil of lamps, in expiation of his soul, and that GOD may remember him for good; may GOD grant him rest, may it be well with him, and may his soul be bound up in the bundle of the living in eternal life, in Paradise, under the throne of glory! May he awake at the time when the dead come to life again, and sing with the rest of them that sleep in the dust, as it is written, ‘Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust.’” *Ibid.*

first resurrection' continued to be the burthen of Christian petitions for the departed.<sup>b</sup> Arnobius testifies that prayers were offered in the Christian assemblies for "those that are released from the bond of their bodies."<sup>c</sup> S. Cyril of Jerusalem mentions the prayer made for the dead during the Sacrifice of the Eucharist; "Then we pray for our holy fathers and bishops, and generally for all that have fallen asleep before us, believing that it will be the greatest advantage to their souls, on whose behalf the supplication is offered, while the Holy and most tremendous Sacrifice is set forth. And I would persuade you by an example. For I am aware that many say this, What is a soul benefited, departing out of this world with sins or without sins, if ye make mention of it in the Prayer? Suppose then a king were to banish some that had offended him; then, that their relations were to weave a chaplet and offer it to him on behalf of those under punishment, would he not grant them remission of the penalties? In the same manner we also offering supplications to Him for those that are fallen asleep, even though they be sinners, do not weave a chaplet, but offer CHRIST that has been slain for our sins, propitiating the Merciful (God) on their behalf and ours."<sup>d</sup> S. Augustine distinctly says, "But if those supplications were wanting, which with right faith and piety are made for the dead, I think it would profit their spirits nothing, though their lifeless bodies were laid in holy places."<sup>e</sup> Not to multiply examples, the connection of Prayer for the Dead with the doctrine of the Resurrection may be seen in such petitions as those of S. Ambrose; <sup>f</sup> and so Bishop Buckridge prayed in his sermon at Bishop Andrewes' funeral; "And so I end, beseeching GOD to give to us all, as He gave to him, our parts in the 'first resurrection' from sin to grace; and to grant to him, and all the faithful and saints departed, and us all with him, a joyful resurrection to everlasting life and glory in JESUS CHRIST. Amen."<sup>g</sup>

<sup>b</sup> *Vide* Mabillon. *Sacrament. Gallican. ap. Mus. Ital. Tom. I. p. 385.* De Liturgia Gallican. p. 246.

<sup>c</sup> Adv. Gentes, Lib. iv. *circa finem*, p. 90.

<sup>d</sup> S. Cyrill. Hierosol. Cateches. Mystag. c. 8, pp. 297, 298.

<sup>e</sup> De Cura gerenda pro Mortuis, c. 4. T. VI. p. 519.

<sup>f</sup> De Obitu Valentiniani, §. 80, T. II. p. 1196.

<sup>g</sup> Andrewes' Sermons, Vol. V. p. 298, Ed. Ang. Cath. Oxon. 1843.

Of the Intercession  
of Saints.

§. 3. Bishop Pearson, commenting on the Communion of Saints, says: "The Saints of GOD, living in the Church of CHRIST, are in communion with all the Saints departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of GOD;"<sup>h</sup> and, in a note on this passage, adds; "This is that part of the Communion of Saints, which those of the Ancients especially insisted upon, who first took notice of it in the Creed."<sup>i</sup> If then the fellowship we have with departed Saints be the point 'especially insisted upon' by the Ancient Church, from whom we have inherited the Creed, wherein doth that fellowship or communion consist? that Communion so often confessed, so little regarded! Pearson says; "But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity."<sup>j</sup> So much is found in Antiquity touching the Intercessions of departed Saints, that it seems only fair to exhibit some revelations of its mind on the subject, leaving it to the judgment of the thoughtful, how far it agrees or not with Bishop Pearson's *dictum*. It cannot be said that there are not *probable* evidences of Scripture in favour of the notion of their Intercession. We read in Jeremiah; "Then said the LORD unto me, Though Moses and Samuel stood before Me, yet My mind could not be toward this people."<sup>k</sup> Had not our LORD Himself supplied us with a rule of interpretation, that, when GOD introduces the names of His departed Saints in connection with Himself, that very circumstance is to be taken as a proof of their continued existence, for "He is not the GOD of the dead, but the GOD of the living;"<sup>l</sup> we should be obliged to regard this passage as applying to what might have been possible, when Moses and Samuel were in the flesh, but was impossible, when the LORD spoke to Jeremiah. Not so, according to the light of the Gospel; but the meaning is, that the then present intercessions of those Saints would be in-

<sup>h</sup> Vol. I. p. 539.

<sup>i</sup> Vol. II. p. 444.

<sup>j</sup> Vol. I. p. 540.

<sup>k</sup> Jer. xv. 1.

<sup>l</sup> S. Mat. xii. 27.

effectual on behalf of the Jews in Jeremiah's time. See also Ezekiel xiv. 13, 20. I believe that passages of Scripture, which represent GOD as accepting His people for the sake of His Saints, that is, allowing *vicarious merit*, make for this purpose. See *Genes. xxvi. 24. Exod. xxxii. 13. 1 Kings xi. 34. xv. 4. 2 Kings xix. 34.* To show that the intercession of the Saints was a notion familiar to the Jews after the Captivity, it is sufficient to mention the vision which Judas Maccabæus had of Jeremiah and the High Priest Onias: "Then Onias answered, saying, This is a lover of the brethren, who prayeth much for the people, and for the holy city, to wit, Jeremias the prophet of God."<sup>m</sup> The Talmud has passages describing Isaac and Elijah as interceding for the dead. (*Midrash Koheleth. Sabbath.*) The Korân seems to exclude the departed infidels from the benefit of the intercession of Saints (page 301). S. John represents the four-and-twenty elders, which are the Saints of GOD reigning with CHRIST, as "having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours" or incense, "which are the prayers of the saints."<sup>n</sup>

The belief of the earliest age of Christianity is expressed in the account of the Martyrdom of S. Ignatius, where many profess that they saw the blessed Martyr praying over them.<sup>o</sup> Origen consoles his friend Ambrosius, preparing for martyrdom, about his children; "Perhaps they will do more, when after such a departure thou dost aid them, than if thou hadst remained with them; for then thou wilt both love them with more knowledge, and more intelligently pray for them."<sup>p</sup> He asks; "Who doubts that the holy Fathers (of the Old Covenant) assist us by their prayers, &c."<sup>q</sup> Again; "But all the Saints who have departed out of this life, still having charity towards those who are in this world, if they be said to have a concern for their salvation and to aid them with their prayers and their intervention with GOD, it will not be improper."<sup>r</sup> S. Cyprian addresses holy virgins; "Remember us then, when

<sup>m</sup> 2 Macc. xv. 14.

<sup>n</sup> Rev. v. 8.

<sup>o</sup> Patres Apostolici, p. 116, Ed. Hefele.

<sup>p</sup> Exhort. ad Martyrium, p. 203.

<sup>q</sup> In Num. Homil. 26, Opp. p.

172, I.

<sup>r</sup> In Cantica Homil. 3, p. 338, I.

virginity shall begin to be honoured in you.”\* Celerinus beseeches Lucianus to beg of his fellow-Confessors, that “whosoever of you shall have been first crowned,” that is, martyred, “he may remit such a sin to those sisters of ours Numeria and Candida.”† S. Cyril of Jerusalem writes: “We then make mention of, first, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that GOD may receive our supplication by their prayers and intercessions.”‡ S. Ambrose says; “May Peter weep for us, who for himself wept well, and turn to us CHRIST’s pious countenance!”§ and he expresses a hope that he might the sooner rejoin his deceased brother Satyrus by his intercessions.¶ S. Jerome urges; “If the Apostles and Martyrs, being yet in the body, can pray for the rest, when they ought to be yet solicitous for themselves, how much more (may they pray) after their crowns, victories, and triumphs? One man, Moses, obtains pardon of GOD for six hundred thousand armed men; § and Stephen, the imitator of his LORD and the first Martyr in CHRIST, prays for pardon for his persecutors; and, after that they begin to be with CHRIST, shall they be less powerful? The Apostle Paul saith that two hundred and seventy-six souls in the ship were given to him; ¶ and, after that being loosed he hath begun to be with CHRIST, is he then to close his mouth, and be unable to say a word on behalf of those who in the whole world have believed on his Gospel?”\*

S. Augustine thus interprets the verse, “the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of JESUS . . . lived and reigned with CHRIST a thousand years;”\* “to wit, the souls of the Martyrs, while their bodies are not yet restored to them. For neither are the souls of the pious dead separated from the Church, which even now is CHRIST’s kingdom. Although not yet with their bodies, yet now their souls reign with Him, whilst those thousand years are running on. Whence we read elsewhere in the same book; ‘Blessed are the dead

\* De Habitu Virginum, Opp. Tom. I. p. 108.

† Ep. 21. Tom. II. p. 46.

‡ Cateches. Mystagog. v. §. 6. p. 297.

§ Hexaemeron. L. v. c. 25. Tom. I. p. 113.

¶ De Fide Resurrectionis, circ. finem, Tom. II. p. 1170.

\* Exod. xxxii.

¶ Acts xxvii. 24, 37.

\* Adv. Vigilantium, c. 3, Opp. T. I. p. 190.

\* Rev. xx. 4.

which die in the LORD: from henceforth saith the SPIRIT, Yea, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.'<sup>b</sup> The Church therefore now first reigns with CHRIST in the living and the dead. 'For to this end,' as the Apostle saith, 'CHRIST both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be LORD both of the dead and living.'<sup>c</sup> But he (S. John) therefore hath mentioned the souls of the Martyrs only, because they chiefly reign when dead, who have contended for the truth even to death."<sup>d</sup> Augustine also speaks of S. Cyprian as being "doubtless present at the Council of Nice through the unity of the SPIRIT."<sup>e</sup> Theodoret writes; "The noble souls of the victorious (Martyrs) traverse heaven, *forming part of the incorporeal choirs*. But their bodies—it is not a single tomb that covers each one of them; but cities and villages, having shared them between them, style them Preservers both of souls and bodies, and Healers, and honour them as tutelars and guardians; and, employing them as intercessors (*πρεσβευταίς*) with the LORD of all, by their means obtain Divine gifts."<sup>f</sup> Rufinus says of the Emperor Theodosius, that "he lay prostrate in sackcloth before the shrines of the Apostles and Martyrs, and intreated faithful aids by the intercession of the Saints."<sup>g</sup> The Empress Galla Placidia (A.D. 451,) gives as a reason for visiting Rome her desire of being present with the Saints Peter and Paul; "who, being set in heavenly places, it is certain, in proportion to their virtue do not despise lower things."<sup>h</sup> In the eleventh action or session of the Council of Chalcedon, the Fathers exclaim, "Flavian lives after death! The Martyr will pray for us!"<sup>i</sup> The Fourth General Council assembled in the Church of S. Euphemia at Chalcedon; and in their report of their proceedings to Pope S. Leo the Fathers ascribe the success of their deliberations to the intercessions

<sup>b</sup> Rev. xiv. 13.

<sup>c</sup> Rom. xiv. 9.

<sup>d</sup> S. Aug. De Civ. Dei, L. xx. c. 9. T. VII. p. 587.—S. Isidore says, that in the sack of Rome by Alaric the Goths spared "whoever named the name of CHRIST or the Saints." (Chronicon, *ad* A.D. 447.)

<sup>e</sup> De Baptismo c. Donatistas, L.

v. c. 17. T. IX. p. 152.

<sup>f</sup> Græcarum Affectionum Curatio, viii. Opp. T. IV. p. 593.

<sup>g</sup> Hist. Eccles. Lib. xi. c. 38, p. 259.

<sup>h</sup> Labbe. T. IV. p. 55.

<sup>i</sup> Φλαβιανὸς μετὰ θάνατον ζῇ· ὁ μάρτυς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εὐξεται. Labbe, T. IV. p. 698.

of S. Euphemia. "For it was GOD that operated, and the gloriously-victorious Euphemia that crowned the assembly in her bridal-chamber; who, having received the definition of faith from us as if it were her own confession, presented it to her Bridegroom through the most pious Emperor and the CHRIST-loving Empress, having quieted all disturbance of opponents, and confirmed the confession of the truth as dear to her, and with hand and tongue subscribed to the votes of all with a view to demonstration."<sup>1</sup> The Bishops of the province of Europa write to the Emperor Leo: "We place the most holy Proterius" (the murdered Archbishop of Alexandria) "in the order and choir of holy Martyrs, and beseech GOD to be merciful and propitious to us by his intercessions."<sup>2</sup> The Council of Tours under S. Perpetuus, held ten years after that of Chalcedon, affirms that "the intercession of the holy and most blessed bishop (*sacerdotis*) Dom Martin, which is accepted of GOD, will obtain," that their constitution be kept.<sup>3</sup> When Avitus Archbishop of Lyons and his brethren were preparing for a disputation with the Arian bishops at the court of Gundebald, king of the Burgundians, A.D. 499, "they unanimously determined to watch the night at the sepulchre of S. Justus, that by his intercession they might obtain from the LORD the petitions of their heart."<sup>4</sup> Anglican divines in general betray the timidity or caution, forced on them by the changes effected in the Second Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI. While asserting that the Communion of Saints extends to those in heaven, who pray for the Church on earth, that they are united by sympathy in CHRIST their Head, they limit the duties thence arising to 1, imitation of the Saints in Heaven (Bp. Nicholson), and 2, to blessing GOD for their examples. (Leslie, *Works*, Vol. I. p. 671.) How vague this is, is clear to a student of Antiquity. For it omits to notice the distinction drawn in Scripture between those whom S. Paul would pray for, that they "may find mercy of the LORD in that day" (2 *Tim.* i. 18), and those "in white robes," who "are before the throne of GOD,

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Chalc. Part. III. cap. 2.  
Labbe T. IV. p. 835.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 907.

<sup>3</sup> Conc. Turon. I. Labbe. T. IV.  
p. 1052.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1319.

and serve Him day and night in His temple." (*Rev.* vii. 15.) The Communion of Saints "will necessarily require, that the former be assisted by the prayers of the living for present comfort and future rest; and that the living beg of God an interest in the prayers which the latter tender Him without ceasing for them." (*Thornd. Just Weights*, c. XVI. §. 4.)

This language was not confined to one school. For we are told, that on Oliver Cromwell's decease Mr. Sterry (a minister) said, "if he was of great use to the people of GOD when he was amongst us, now he will be much more so, *being ascended to heaven to sit at the right hand of Jesus Christ, there to intercede for us, and to be mindful of us on all occasions.*" (*General Ludlow's Memoirs*.)

§. 4. "We do sometimes meet in ancient authors with the intercession of Saints in general, which we also acknowledge," says Archbishop Bramhall; "or an oblique invocation of them (as you term it), that is, a prayer directed to GOD, that He will hear the intercession of the Saints for us, which we do not condemn; or a wish, or a rhetorical apostrophe, or perhaps something more in some single ancient author: but for an ordinary invocation in particular necessities, and much more for public invocation in the Liturgies of the Church, we meet not with it for the first six hundred years, or thereabouts." <sup>a</sup> If we consult Petavius on the subject, we shall find, that all his references are to Post-Nicene Fathers; and that even the passages adduced in favour of Invocation imply rhetorical apostrophes or private orisons rather than public invocations in the Church prayers.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

I will endeavour to show briefly, how the Invocation of Saints grew gradually out of the general belief in their Intercessions. Eusebius mentions that in his lifetime it was a custom (*ἔθος*) with Christians "to go to the tombs of the Martyrs, and make their prayers by them, and to honour their happy souls." <sup>o</sup> S. Ambrose, in his funeral sermon on his deceased brother Satyrus, says: "We thought thee restored, whom we see to have been deferred; for we now know that thy passage (home) was obtained by thy vows at the holy

<sup>a</sup> Works, Vol. I. p. 58.

<sup>o</sup> Præp. Evang. L. xiii. c. 11, p. 663.



Martyr Laurence." <sup>p</sup> This *need* not imply that Satyrus had invoked S. Laurence for his intercessions: but how will it read, when we find Ambrose a little later telling his congregation, "There is no doubt that by your tears the patronage of the Apostles is obtained"? <sup>q</sup> Elsewhere he teaches; "Angels, who have been given to us for a safeguard, are to be intreated on our behalf; the Martyrs are to be intreated, whose patronage we seem to claim for ourselves by a certain pledge of the body. They can petition for our sins, who, even if they had any, have washed them in their own blood; for they are GOD'S Martyrs, our prelates, the overseers of our life and actions. Let us not blush to employ them as intercessors for our infirmity; for they themselves, even when they conquered, have known the infirmities of the body." <sup>r</sup> S. Gregory Nyssen directly invokes S. Theodore, but it is in a highly oratorical address: "Convene the choir of thy brethren the Martyrs," are some of his expressions, "and supplicate with all; let the prayers of many righteous men loose the sins of peoples and tribes; remind Peter, arouse Paul, John too the Divine and beloved disciple, that they may take thought on behalf of the Churches which they established, for which they wore their chains, for which they bore the dangers and the deaths." <sup>s</sup> Theodoret leaves no doubt on one's mind, that in his time (and he was at the Third and Fourth General Councils) Invocation of Saints must have been a common practice in the East; and it must be remembered that he wrote against the Pagans, who actually taxed the Christians with the worship of dead men. Far from denying the invocation, he writes: "And some setting out on a journey, *intreat them* (the Martyrs) to be their fellow-travellers and guides of their way; others, having obtained a (safe) return, offer the acknowledgment of their thanks; not approaching them as Gods, but *intreating them as divine men*, and beseeching them to be intercessors on their behalf." <sup>t</sup>

<sup>p</sup> De Excessu Fratris sui Satyri, §. 17, Tom. II. p. 1118.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* §. 29, p. 1121.

<sup>r</sup> De Viduis, c. 9, T. II. p. 200.

<sup>s</sup> Orat. in S. Theodor. M. Opp. T. I. p. 1018. See his Life of S.

Ephrem Syrus, where a person is described as invoking S. Ephrem: "Αγιε Έφραϊμ, βοήθει μοι. (Opp. T. I. p. 1047.)

<sup>t</sup> Græc. Affectt. Curat. vii. T. IV. p. 605.

S. Augustine is abundant in disclaimers of any intention of paying Divine or idolatrous honours to the Saints; \* but he recognises the existing practice of Invocation; † and declares with respect to burying in or near the chapels of the Martyrs, “I see not what aid it is to the dead, unless to this end; that, when the living recollect where the bodies of those whom they love have been placed, they may commend them to the same Saints as to patrons adopted by them, to be aided with the LORD by praying.” ‡ He himself indirectly invokes S. Cyprian: “And blessed Cyprian indeed, the corruptible body no longer pressing down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle no longer weighing down the mind that museth upon many things, § more serenely sees through the truth, the grant of which he won through charity. Let him then by his prayers aid us labouring in the mortality of this flesh as it were in a dark cloud, that (the LORD granting it) we may, as far as possible, imitate his graces.” ¶ S. Cyril of Alexandria is the first whom I find distinguishing between *relative* and *honorary* worship (σχετικῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς) and direct absolute Divine worship or *Latreia* (λατρευτικῶς). He thus repels the charge of undue honour paid to the Martyrs: “The holy Martyrs to be sure we neither affirm to be gods, nor are we wont to worship, to wit, with absolute worship, but relatively and in the way of honour; yea, rather we crown them with the highest honours, as having nobly contended for the truth, and so preserved the genuineness of faith as not to have spared even their life itself.” \*

The first direct public invocation, which I find on record, as distinguished from rhetorical addresses, occurs in the acclamations of the second Synod of Rome under Pope Gelasius, A.D. 495. † In the letters of Pope Hormisdas, A.D. 519, we

\* *Vid.* De Moribus Eccles. Catholicæ, L. i. c. 34. T. I. p. 713. De Vera Religione, c. 55. *Ibid.* p. 786. Ep. xvii. T. II. p. 22. Contra Faustum, L. xx. c. 21, T. VIII. p. 347. De Civ. Dei, L. viii. c. 27, T. VII. p. 217. *Ib.* L. x. c. 1, p. 238.

† “Quod frequentatur ore Christiano, cum se cuique Sanctorum humilis quisque commendat et dicit,

‘Memor mei esto.’” (De Civ. Dei, L. xxi. c. 27, p. 653.) Compare his account of Florentius of Hippo, L. xxii. c. 8, p. 668.

‡ De Cura gerenda pro Mortuis, c. 4, T. VI. p. 519.

§ Wisdom ix. 15.

¶ De Baptismo c. Donatistas, L. vii. c. 1, T. IX. p. 185.

\* Contra Julianum, L. vi. p. 203.

† “Domine Petre, tu illum serva.

find frequent evidence of the growing practice of invocation of Saints; as, for example: "We daily supplicate blessed Peter the Apostle for you, that he would second (*suffragetur*) your vows with the LORD, and fulfil the course of good will."<sup>b</sup> In the year 536, the Synod of the three Palestines writes to John of Constantinople; "Supplicate with us the holy and glorified Virgin and God's-parent Mary to intercede for the peace of the most holy churches;"<sup>c</sup> and the language is become substantially what it was in the Middle Ages and is still in the Greek and Latin Communions; as, when we read of Zacharias Archdeacon of Constantinople giving notice to the people of his intention of celebrating Holy Communion the following LORD'S Day, "to the glory of the LORD CHRIST our God, and of the holy glorious our Lady God's-parent and ever-Virgin Mary."<sup>d</sup> But the introduction of the Virgin's name and probably of her invocation into the public Liturgy was current, at least in the Patriarchate of Antioch, since the time of Peter the Fuller, soon after the Council of Chalcedon.\*

With what feelings the Ancient Church regarded the Saints we may gather from S. Augustine. Being charged by the Donatists with being a follower of Cæcilianus, his reply is: "We are in the Church, wherein Cæcilianus played the Bishop and died. We recite his name at the altar; we communicate with his memory, as it were that of a brother, not as of a father or mother."<sup>e</sup> "Are we not to honour the

dictum duodecies." (Labbe. T. IV. p. 1275.) The use of the title *Dominus* applied to the Saints is found in S. Leo: "Sancta nunc synodus humilitatis nostre scriptis, auctoritate *domini* mei beatissimi Petri Apostoli et merito roboratis, religiosa unanimitate consentiens," etc. (Labbe. T. III. p. 1333.) It was continued in the Middle Ages; e.g. "que le Roy desiroit avoir le corporal, sur quoi chantoit monseigneur S. Pierre." (Philippe De Comines, Chroniques de Loys xi. chap. 133.) And, "Ioy que je doy à Dieu et à monseigneur saint Denis." (Chroniques de Froissart, Livre i. ch. 6.)

<sup>b</sup> Ep. 33. *ap.* Labbe. T. IV. p.

1480. So much was the practice on the increase, that in the course of eighty letters of this Pontiff he invokes or refers to the intercessions of S. Mary *four* times (Epp. *ap.* Labbe. T. IV. pp. 1521, 24, 35, 38), and SS. Peter and Paul *twelve* times (*Ibid.* pp. 1423, 26, 40, 44, 56, 80, 84, 85, 92, 1513, 18). This hardly ever occurs in the epistles of previous Popes.

<sup>c</sup> Labbe. T. V. p. 189.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* p. 212.

<sup>e</sup> Cf. Theodorus Lector, p. 566, and Nicephorus Callistus, Eccles. Hist. L. xv. c. 28. T. II. p. 634.

<sup>f</sup> Collatio Carthag. *ap.* Labbe. T. II. p. 1490.

chiefs of all mankind, that make intercessions to GOD on our behalf?" asks Damascene. "Yea, we are to honour them, by erecting temples to GOD in their name, bringing oblations, celebrating their memories,<sup>a</sup> and rejoicing in them spiritually, that our joy may be shared by them who with us call upon GOD; lest, endeavouring to serve them, we on the contrary provoke them to wrath; for by whom GOD is served, His servants also will rejoice in them. Let us raise columns to them and visible images, and ourselves become living columns and images of them by imitation of their virtues."<sup>b</sup>

§. 5. The public invocation of Saints and other branches of their cultus most clearly mark off the Greek and Latin churches from the Reformed communions. None of the former can allow as 'Catholics' those who practise no devotion to the Mother of GOD. The latter charge the former with *idolatry*; while Anglicans, if they stop short of that, illogically talk of *Mariolatry*, which implies giving to Mary the worship due to GOD Alone, and that must be *idolatry*. If so, then are those Churches apostates from Christianity; and CHRIST's promise to be with His Church "all the days" is cancelled. The Council of Trent simply pronounces the practice of invocation "a wholesome thing." The Church of England insists it is "repugnant to the Word of GOD." (*Article xxii.*) The one is silent as to the enormous growth of what the first Christians knew not; the other condemns in the lump without distinction.

Now had mere Invocation been thought heresy, not to say idolatry, men like Ambrose, Augustine, Basil, and the Gregories, would have denounced the first inkling of it. But they have not done so. Thorndike speaks of their use of it in sermons as "letters sent without promise of being delivered." (Vol. V. p. 589.) But is Faith to venture nothing? Did not the woman who touched the hem of CHRIST's garment, and they whose faith found a resource in the shadow of Peter and in materials hallowed by contact with Paul's body, (*Acts* v. 15. xix. 12.) send letters without promise of

Resolution  
respecting  
it.

<sup>a</sup> τὰς τούτων μνήμας γυμναστές.  
perhaps, 'decorating their Memo-  
ries,' that is, the churches dedicated

in memory of the Saints.

<sup>b</sup> S. Jo. Damasc. De Orth. Fide,  
c. 92.

delivery, yet well repaid? Or is Imagination to be debarred Christianity? Are not S. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians full of references to angelic hierarchies, which to a Protestant mean nothing?

Thorndike finds his answer in Theodoret (above p. 472,) and in S. Augustine (*De Miraculis S. Stephani*). In truth, Invocation of Saints belongs to Natural Religion; is noxious or wholesome, according as it is kept in subjection to Revelation; has been practised by Jews, (*Sanct. Cath.* p. 183,) and Mahometans; (they sometimes pray Mohammed to support by his powerful intercession the prayers they address to God. (*Fatma Zaida, note on the Korân*, p. 225.))—is perilous, when it proceeds on theories of Mediatorial thrones, as set up by Socinus; and is outside legitimate Dogma, as I infer from Damascene's remarkable silence in the passage above cited. (§. 4.) The Korân expresses the sentiment of nature. "There is no harm in beseeching the souls of the faithful. It is an error," (if so,) "proceeding from the poetry which God has allowed men's hearts." (p. 224.)

Of Purgatorial Doctrines in the Primitive Church.

§. 6. Beside the view of the intermediate state of the departed already given, a theory of Purgatory prevailed among the Latins; which I will give in the words of its principal champion at the Council of Florence, A.D. 1438, when it was first synodically accepted. "After their departure hence," says Cardinal Julian, "the souls of the deceased, such as are pure and free of all stain, as the souls of the Saints, forthwith depart into joy: but the souls of such as have fallen into sins after Baptism, then have truly repented and confessed, but have not yet succeeded in fulfilling the rule enjoined them by their confessor nor in rendering sufficient fruits of repentance to the expiation of their proper sins, such souls are cleansed by the purging fire, some sooner, some more slowly, in proportion to their sins; and after that they have been purified they depart to joy."<sup>1</sup> When we examine the monuments of Antiquity, we shall discover that with hardly an exception the theories of a purgatorial fire are connected either with such a view of hell punishment as contemplates its cessation

<sup>1</sup> Silvester Sguropulus, Hist. Concilii Florentini, V. c. 13. p. 131. Ed. Creighton.

after revolutions of ages, or with the cleansing terrors of the Judgment-Day. But if other ideas occur, they are put forth with doubt and hesitation, not with the directness and precision that generally characterise Catholic tradition. The first allusion to Purgatorial punishment is contained in the Shepherd of S. Hermas;<sup>j</sup> but the interpretation of the passage is disputed. Perhaps the first certain testimony is drawn from the Acts of the Passion of S. Perpetua, A.D. 202. She beholds in a dream her young brother Dinocrates (who had died at the age of seven), squalid and suffering from thirst. She is unaccountably reminded of him, and prays for him; she has another vision, and sees him relieved and happy.<sup>k</sup>

About that period, Origen wrote much about the purging of the soul by fire. Let us see what his statements amount to. He says expressly; "But we are not aware of an incorporeal essence being consumed by fire, nor of the soul of man being resolved into fire."<sup>l</sup> And, citing the verse "For our God is a consuming fire,"<sup>m</sup> he says; "All these things are said figuratively to illustrate intellectual nature by usual and corporeal names. And as, if sins be said to be wood and hay and stubble, we would not say that sins are bodies; and, if good works be said to be gold and silver and precious stones, we would not say that good works are bodies; so too, if God be said to be a fire consuming the wood and the hay and the stubble and every substance of sin, we should not suppose Him to be a body."<sup>n</sup> "The Divine Word then saith, that our 'God is a consuming fire,'<sup>o</sup> and that 'streams of fire come forth from before Him,'<sup>p</sup> yea, and that He cometh in 'like a refiner's fire and like fuller's sope,'<sup>q</sup> that He may purge his people. Since then He is said to be a consuming fire, we inquire what is fitting to be consumed by God? And we affirm that GOD as a fire consumes wickedness, and the things done by it, figuratively said to be wood and hay and stubble.

<sup>j</sup> Lib. i. Visio iii. c. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Ruinart. Acta Martt. Sincera, pp. 89, 90. This account is quoted by S. Augustine, De Animæ Origine, L. i. c. 10; L. iii. c. 9. T. X. pp. 343, 379.

<sup>l</sup> Contra Celsum, L. v. p. 335.

<sup>m</sup> Heb. xxi. 29.

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 333, 4.

<sup>o</sup> Deut. iv. 24.

<sup>p</sup> Daniel vii. 10.

<sup>q</sup> Mal. iii. 2.

The bad man to be sure is said to build wood and hay and stubble on the foundation of the Word that is before laid.\* If then any one has to show that these things were otherwise conceived by the writer, and can exhibit the wicked man as bodily building on (the foundation) wood or hay or stubble, it is clear that the fire too shall be conceived (to be) material and sensuous. But if on the contrary the works of the wicked man be spoken of figuratively, being said to be wood or hay or stubble; how doth it not occur from the passage, what sort of fire we understand such wood be consumed (by)? For 'the fire,' it says, 'shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss.' But what sort of work that is burned is spoken of in these words, but every work that is done of wickedness? Therefore is our GOD a consuming fire, as we have related; and thus He cometh as a refiner's fire, to refine the rational nature, fulfilled with the lead that is of wickedness and the other impure matters, that have adulterated the soul's nature of gold or of silver (that I may so express it). And so also streams of fire are said to be from before GOD, Who will cause the evil to disappear that is mingled throughout the whole soul."†

"The Word then saith, that those that have been consummately purified in their doctrines and habits and ruling principle alone are without a taste of the fire and the punishments; but those that are not such, according to their desert needing the dispensation of punishment by fire, will be in this state for a certain end: which it becomes GOD to bring on those, that have been made after His image, and have lived beside the will of the nature that is after His image."‡

But all this makes little towards sustaining the later doctrine of Purgatory; for it will appear, that Origen, pondering the consequences that follow from the type of Hell or Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom's being near Jerusalem, was afraid to give utterance to all he felt. But what he *did* think cannot be doubtful; for he says, "It is not safe to trust to

\* 1 Cor. iii. 11—15.

† *Ibid.* L. iv. p. 174.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 248.

writing the explanation of such matters, inasmuch as the many need no teaching beyond that of the punishment of sinners. For it is not profitable to go further, because of those that scarcely from fear of eternal punishment would to some extent lessen the effusion of wickedness and of the sins depending on it."<sup>u</sup> Speaking of Pharaoh's being drowned in the Red Sea, he remarks: "In which drowning it is not to be thought forsooth, that GOD's providence towards Pharaoh is over; for in that he was drowned, he is not also forthwith to be supposed to have substantially perished."<sup>v</sup> "GOD, Who is cognisant of secrets and knoweth all things before they come to pass, according to His abundant kindness defers the cures of such persons and further delays their healing, and (so to say) cures them while He doth not cure them, lest prosperous health should render them incurable."<sup>w</sup> And again; "GOD, the most skilful cultivator of all His creation, dissembles and defers, doubtless to another season, these things, which (it seems to us) ought sooner to have been healed, lest their surface rather than their inside should be cured."<sup>x</sup> Observe, that Origen here doth not appear to contemplate a change of condition after the final judgment, but after death; in fact, he converts Gehenna into Purgatory. So doth the Korân intimate that the wicked abide in hell, "some eternally, or for ages, or for a season, as GOD wills." (p. 17.) Nor, if the race be spent at the hour of death, are we made privy to the decision of the Most High. The Talmud expresses the same feeling as Origen's in regard to some who suffered in the Deluge, (*Bereshith Rabbah*.) sanctioned, I think, by 1 S. Peter iii. 19; and even as to Korah and Achan. (*Bamidbar Rabbah*.) The exceptional terror of their end suggests hope that a special mercy balanced the awful example.

Tertullian understands by the purging of souls after death a delay of their resurrection in their bodies, or at least of their glorification. "When," he says, "we understand the 'prison,' which the Gospel demonstrates, to be hell, and

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* Lib. vi. p. 301.

<sup>v</sup> Peri Archon, L. iii. c. 1, p. 454, G.

<sup>w</sup> *Ibid.* L.

<sup>x</sup> *Ibid.* p. 453, F.

<sup>y</sup> S. Matt. xii. 32.



‘the uttermost farthing’ we interpret as some moderate offence to be there expiated by a delay of the resurrection, no one will doubt that the soul pays somewhat in hell, saving the fulness of the resurrection, by means of the flesh too.”<sup>a</sup> Like Origen, he knows not of the soul’s being punished apart from the body; “The soul alone, without stable substance, that is, flesh, can suffer nothing.”<sup>a</sup> “That which has been committed in the body cannot be judged but in the body. For God would be unfair, if a person is not punished or aided by that whereby he hath worked.”<sup>b</sup>

S. Basil remarks on the words, “He shall baptize you with the HOLY GHOST and with fire;”<sup>c</sup> “meaning by the baptism of fire the probation in the Judgment, as the Apostle saith, ‘The fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is;’ and again, ‘For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire.’”<sup>d</sup> And S. Augustine, interpreting the passage, “And it came to pass, that, when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces:”<sup>e</sup> says, “It signifies that now in the end of the world the carnal are to be judged by fire. For as the affliction of the City of God, such as never was before, which is expected to be under Antichrist, is signified by the horror of great darkness that fell upon Abraham when the sun was going down, that is, the end of the world approaching: so at sunset, that is, now at the very end, there is signified by that fire the Day of Judgment separating the carnal to be saved by fire and to be damned in fire.”<sup>f</sup> The same Father, even when he broaches the notion of Purgatory, speaks of it as a problem. “That some such thing also takes place after this life, is not incredible; and whether it be so may be a subject of inquiry, and be either discovered or remain hidden, that some believers are saved by a purging fire, so much the more slowly or speedily as they have more or less loved perishing goods: yet

<sup>a</sup> Tert. De Anima, c. 58, p. 307.  
Cf. c. 35, p. 291.

<sup>b</sup> Apolog. c. 48, p. 38.

<sup>c</sup> Adv. Marcion. L. v. c. 12, p. 476.

<sup>d</sup> S. Matt. iii. 12.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 13.—S. Basil. De Spiritu Sancto, c. 15, Opp. Tom. II. p. 178.

<sup>f</sup> Gen. xv. 17.

<sup>g</sup> De Civ. Dei, L. xvi. c. 24, T. VII. p. 437.

not such, of whom it is said, that they shall not possess the kingdom of God, unless the same crimes be remitted to them suitably penitent."<sup>g</sup>

S. Gregory the Great, whose authority promoted the wider acceptance of the doctrine, still speaks cautiously, as may be seen from his words, which I give entire. "*Peter*. I would like to learn, if we are to believe in a purging fire after death. *Gregory*. The LORD saith in the Gospel, 'Walk while ye have the light.'<sup>h</sup> He saith also by the Prophet, 'In an acceptable time I have heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee.'<sup>i</sup> Which the Apostle Paul expounding saith, 'Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.'<sup>j</sup> Solomon also saith; 'Whosoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.'<sup>k</sup> David also saith, 'Thy mercy, O LORD, endureth for ages.'<sup>l</sup> ('*Quoniam in sæculum misericordia Ejus*.) From which sentences to be sure it is agreed, that, even as a person is when he departs hence, so is he presented in the judgment. But yet touching some light faults a purging fire before the judgment is to be believed, according to that which the Truth saith, 'But whosoever speaketh (blasphemy) against the HOLY GHOST, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.'<sup>m</sup> In which sentence we are given to understand that some sins may be loosed in this world, but others in the world to come. For what is denied of one, the consequent meaning is clear, that it is granted of some. But yet, as I said before, it is to be believed that this may be done, of few and the least sins, such as continual idle speech, immoderate laughter, or the sin of care for one's property, which is scarcely managed without fault even by those who know how they ought to avoid faultiness; or the error of ignorance in matters not weighty; all which things weigh even after death, if they have not been forgiven men while yet in this life. For when Paul saith that CHRIST is the foundation, adding; 'If any man build upon this

<sup>g</sup> Enchiridion, c. 69. Tom. VI. p. 222.

<sup>h</sup> S. John xii. 35.

<sup>i</sup> Isa. xlix. 8.

<sup>j</sup> 2 Cor. vi. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Eccles. ix. 10.

<sup>l</sup> Ps. cxxxviii. 8.

<sup>m</sup> S. Matt. xii. 32.

foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble;—the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire:”<sup>a</sup> although this may be understood of the fire of tribulation applied to us in this life; yet if any one should understand this of the fire of future purgation, it should be anxiously weighed, that he (*Paul*) hath said that that man may be saved by fire, not who builds on this foundation iron, brass, or lead, that is, greater sins and therefore harder and then already indissoluble; but wood, hay, stubble, that is, minute and most light sins, which the fire may easily consume. This however is to be known, that there at least a person will obtain no cleansing of the least sins; unless while yet in this life he wins by good actions that he may there obtain it.”<sup>o</sup> The hypothetical tone of S. Gregory shows, that Purgatory was still far from being a universally received tenet of the Church. He admits elsewhere, that “frequently fear itself alone purges from the least offences the departing souls of the righteous.”<sup>p</sup>

His concluding warning is echoed by Tertullian; “When can we please GOD, unless while we are in this flesh? Other time of working there is none, I imagine:”<sup>q</sup> by S. Cyprian; “When we shall have departed hence, there is now no place of repentance, no effect of satisfaction; here is life either lost or kept; here do we provide for eternal salvation by the worship of GOD and the fruit of faith:”<sup>r</sup> and by the Author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox; “The narrative about Lazarus and the rich man is a delineation of the Word, teaching, that after the departure of the soul out of the body men cannot obtain any benefit by way of any providence or study.”<sup>s</sup>

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 12—15.

<sup>o</sup> S. Greg. Magn. P.P. I. Dialogg. L. iv. c. 39, T. III. p. 338.

<sup>p</sup> *Ibid.* L. iv. c. 46. p. 341. In A.D. 385, Pope Siricius seems to make Penance to be the purging fire: “Quatenus tantum facinus continua lamentatione defientes pu-

rificatorio possint poenitudinis igne decoquere.” (Labbe. Tom. II. p. 1019.)

<sup>q</sup> Adv. Marcion. L. v. c. 10. p. 474.

<sup>r</sup> Ad Demetrianum, T. I. p. 196.

<sup>s</sup> *Ad calcem* S. Justini M. Opp. p. 427. qu. 60.

§. 7. Most Protestants are led to deny any progress, change, or development of souls after death by a single passage of the Old Testament, cited apart from its context ; "In the place where a tree falleth, there it shall lie." (*Eccles.* xi. 3.) While they disregard our Lord's express words, "In my Father's house," οἰκία, dwelling-place, "are many mansions," μοαί. (*S. John* xiv. 2.) The first passage merely asserts that the fall of the tree marks the close of its being *as a tree* ; as the precipitation of rain marks the end of the rain-cloud. But what of the tree viewed *as timber* ? Surely, its fall is in order only to its seasoning and future employment in a new capacity. We believe that they who come within the Covenant of Grace have their "pardon sealed in heaven before they go hence." But they must be incapable of thought or else entertain inadequate notions of the glory and holiness of GOD, who imagine that ordinary Christians, who do not answer to the high requirements of the Covenant, are at death meet for the Vision of GOD. Rather will such as be saved "go from strength to strength," until they "appear to the GOD of gods in Sion." (*Ps.* 84.) For the 'mansiones' or μοαί signify 'stages' in a progress or journey ; as is clear from the use of the terms in S. Athanasius and Sulpicius Severus, and in the ancient Itinerary of a Pilgrim from Bordeaux to Jerusalem.

Of the Law  
of Progress  
after Death.

The words "I go to prepare a place for you" imply an employment of the glorified Humanity of CHRIST, bearing allusion to the despatch of harbingers to prepare a 'mansion,' station, or caravanserai for the reception of travellers in 'the East. If we extend the operation of a law of Progress to eternity, it must be by conceiving Eternity as *everlasting succession of ages* ; a notion which seems borne out by the εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, 'into the ages,' which the English Version renders by 'for ever.' (*S. Matt.* vi. 13.) The everlasting Now would seem to belong only to the Uncreated. The grant of 'white robes' to the Martyrs, with the injunction to wait for their brethren, (*Rev.* vi. 11.) points to the conclusion of a period. If S. Augustine could venture to interpret 'the evening' and 'the morning' of Creation by referring to the intelligence of Angels, the *æons* of Eternity may be rendered

perceptible to finite beings by the successive development of God's wonders, which a limited mind can never simultaneously embrace.

Of the Millennium.

§. 8. In treating of the condition of the departed before the resurrection, we must not omit to notice the theories that have been propounded in consequence of the Apocalyptic vision of souls, that "they lived and reigned with CHRIST a thousand years."<sup>4</sup> It is extraordinary, that, when *souls* are so distinctly mentioned, persons should have been found to connect with this revelation the most glowing pictures of earthly and sensuous enjoyment, entirely alien to the spirit of the Gospel. Taking in a bare literal sense the words of S. Peter, that "one day is with the LORD as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,"<sup>5</sup> they maintained, that, when the first six thousand years of the world's existence shall have been completed, the Saints would rise to celebrate the Sabbath of the seventh Chiliad. "Which opinion," as Augustine complains, "would be in some sense tolerable, if any spiritual delights were believed to be ready for the Saints in that Sabbath by the presence of the LORD."<sup>6</sup> Nor can it be denied, that the opinion comes down to us under most respectable patronage. S. Justin Martyr says; "But I, and if there be any right-thinking Christians in all respects, both know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and the prophets Ezekiel and Isaías and the rest acknowledge a thousand years at Jerusalem built and adorned and amplified."<sup>7</sup> S. Irenæus professes to deliver it as the tradition of some Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles, that according to the varying merits of the Saints, that is, the different degrees of success wherewith GOD hath blessed their labours in this world, some should be translated to heaven, some enjoy the delights of Paradise, and some possess the holy land and the beauty of the city which descendeth from above, the heavenly Jerusalem.<sup>8</sup> How gross these speculations were may be seen from S. Jerome's sketch of the reply made to

<sup>4</sup> Rev. xx. 4.

<sup>5</sup> 2 S. Pet. iii. 8.

<sup>6</sup> De Civ. Dei, L. xx. c. 7. T. 504.

<sup>7</sup> Dialog. cum Tryphone, p. 307.

<sup>8</sup> Adv. Hæres. L. v. c. 36. p.

VII. p. 581.

Irenæus by Dionysius of Alexandria; "smiling at the fable of the thousand years, and the Jerusalem of gold and gems upon earth, the restoration of the Temple, the blood of the sacrifices, the rest of the Sabbath, the injury of circumcision, marriages, births, the education of children, the delicacy of banquets, and the servitude of all the Gentiles; and again, wars, armies, and triumphs, and the deaths of the vanquished, and the decease of the sinner a hundred years old." \*

Tertullian exhibits the Millennium in a more spiritual aspect, but still strangely mixed up with fanciful details. "For we confess too," he says, "that a kingdom has been promised us on earth; but before heaven, but in another state; to wit, after the resurrection for a thousand years, in a city of Divine workmanship, Jerusalem that is brought down from heaven, which the Apostle denotes as our mother from above, and pronouncing our 'politeuma,' that is, citizenship to be in the heavens assigns it to some, doubtless, a heavenly city. This (city) both Ezekiel knew, and the Apostle John saw." He appeals to the prophecies of the Montanist sectaries, and to certain aerial phenomena said to have taken place in Judæa; and proceeds: "This (city) we say has been provided by GOD to receive the Saints at the resurrection and cherish them with plenty of all good things, to wit, spiritual, in compensation for those things which in the world we have either despised or lost. If indeed it is both just and worthy of GOD, that His servants should exult there also, where they have been afflicted in His Name. This is the account of the earthly kingdom; after whose thousand years, (within which age is concluded the resurrection of the Saints rising sooner or later according to their merits), then, when both the destruction of the world and the conflagration of the judgment have begun, we shall be transferred into the heavenly kingdom, having been changed in the twinkling of an eye into angelical substance, to wit, by the over-clothing of incorruption." †

In the new earth, which GOD hath promised, saith Origen, "I think are the true and living forms of that observance,

\* S. Hieron. Comm. in Esaiam, Lib. xviii. in *Proemio*, T. IV. p. 214.

† Tert. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iii. c. 23. pp. 411, 412.

which Moses delivered by the shadow of the Law ; of which it is said, ' Who serve (*unto*) the example and shadow of heavenly things,'<sup>a</sup> for those, to wit, who served in the Law. But to Moses himself it was said, ' Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount.'<sup>b</sup> Whence it seems to me, that as on this earth the Law was a schoolmaster indeed to those who needed to be brought to CHRIST by it, being by it taught and instructed how they might the more easily afterwards receive the more perfect institutions of CHRIST: so also another earth receiving the Saints may first imbue them with the institutions of a true and eternal Law, that they may the more easily also gain those perfect institutions of heaven, to which nothing more can be added ; wherein will be that which is called *the Eternal Gospel* and ever New Testament that shall never wax old."<sup>c</sup> So too S. Methodius, in his Banquet of the Ten Virgins, makes Tysiane say ; " For as the Israelites, having gone forth out of Egypt, journeyed first and came to the Tents (Succoth) ; and again having removed thence came to the land of Promise ; so then shall we also. For I too having journeyed from Egypt, *this life*, come first to the *resurrection*, the true Feast of Tabernacles ; and there having pitched my tent adorned with the fruits of virtue, on the first day of the Feast of the Resurrection, *the judgment*, feast with CHRIST during the *Millennium of rest*, the seven days so called, the true Sabbath. Then again following JESUS ' that is passed into the heavens,'<sup>d</sup> I come again like them, after the rest of the Feast of Tabernacles, into the land of Promise, *the heavens* ; not remaining in tents, that is, my body (or tabernacle) not remaining such as it is, but after the Millennium being changed from human shape and corruption into angelical size and beauty. There lastly, when the Feast of the Resurrection is accomplished, we Virgins pass from the wondrous place of the tabernacle to the greater and better things, ascending to the very home of GOD above the heavens, ' with

<sup>a</sup> Heb. viii. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Exod. xxv. 40.

<sup>c</sup> Peri Archon, Lib. iii. c. 6. p.

466. H.

<sup>d</sup> Heb. iv. 14.

the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that keep holy-day,' as saith the Psalmist."\*

The opinion of the Millennium appears to have been held by S. Ambrose;† and Jerome mentions, that a very great multitude of Catholics maintained this view, so that he already presaged what animosity would be excited against him in many quarters by his opposition to the tenet.‡ After his and Augustine's labours, it may be said that the belief of the Church in general is expressed by Gennadius: "In the Divine promises we expect nothing earthly or transitory, as the Meletians hope: no nuptial bond, as Cerinthus and Marcion rave: not what belongs to meat or drink, as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Lactantius agree, with Papias their authority: nor that there will be a kingdom of CHRIST upon earth for a thousand years after the resurrection, and that the Saints will reign with Him in pleasures, as Nepos taught."§ If the Millennary doctrine has been revived in later times, it has generally been stripped of its grosser details; as, when More says, "The world then in the seventh Chiliad will be assumed up into GOD, snatched up by His SPIRIT, inacted by His power. The Jerusalem that comes down from heaven will then in a most glorious and eminent manner flourish upon earth."¶ (Consult Thorndike, Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 264, for the influence of fanatic Chiliasts on Hobbes in the Leviathan.) Some of the primitive Martyrologists were persuaded that by the Millennium is meant the state of the blessed Martyrs, *already in mind and spirit reigning with God.*" (Sanct. Cath. p. 251.) Indeed, that persuasion underlies the whole question of the *Cultus Sanctorum*, as maintained by the Church Greek as well as Latin; and must some day be calmly re-examined by the Church of England, if the hope of visible Unity be not an empty dream.

\* Ps. xlii. 4.—S. Method. Conviv. Decem Virginum, ap. Auctarium Novissimum Bibl. P.P. p. 129, Ed. Combetis.

† In Psalm. i. Enarratio, §. 54, Tom. I. p. 763.

‡ S. Hieron. *ubi supra*.

§ De Eccles. Dogmatibus, c. 25, ad calcem S. Aug. Opp. T. VIII. p. 78.

¶ Defence of the Moral Cabbala, chap. ii. p. 164.



## CHAPTER XXXI.

## OF THE RESURRECTION AND THE FUTURE STATE.

Argument  
from Author-  
ity in its  
favour.

§. 1. THE doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body and its re-union with the soul necessarily follows that atonement of CHRIST, whereby death is destroyed and the regeneration of all things fulfilled. And therefore S. Paul justly puts it forward as a condition to the success and even the value of the Gospel. "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is CHRIST not risen: and if CHRIST be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. \* If in this life only we have hope in CHRIST, we are of all men most miserable."<sup>1</sup> If the deeds done in the flesh did not entail on it a future retribution of weal or woe, what need had he or his fellow-sufferers to witness for the Faith even to death? They might spare their pains, is his argument. "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour? \* If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."<sup>2</sup> But inasmuch as Death, being the separation of the soul from the body, came into the world as the wages of sin, due to the transgression of the first Adam: it was needful, that the Resurrection, being the re-union of the body and soul, should follow as the reward of holiness, due to the merits and obedience of the second Adam. "But now is CHRIST risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by Man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: CHRIST the first-fruits: afterward they that are

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 13, 14, 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 30, 32.

CHRIST's at His coming."<sup>1</sup> This doctrine is not absent from the Old Testament; although "it is now made manifest by the appearing of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel."<sup>m</sup> If GOD obliged Himself to His ancient people for the world to come but by *intimations*, (*Thornd.* Vol. IV. Pt. I. p. 332.) yet such expressions as Isaiah's, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise,"<sup>n</sup> and Ezekiel's vision of the resurrection of dry bones,<sup>o</sup> are far too vivid pictures not to have made a durable impression on the mind of Israel. They seem to usher in on prepared auditors the full and direct statement of Daniel: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."<sup>p</sup> And the miracles wrought by Elijah and Elisha in raising from the dead the widow's son of Sarepta and the Shunamite's, the restoration of Jonah after he had lain three days and three nights in the fish's belly, the mysterious translation of Enoch, and the disappearance of Elijah bodily into heaven, were facts, that must have paved the way to the ready acceptance of our LORD's plain prediction; "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear (the Son of Man's) voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."<sup>q</sup> But He gave the best proof of the Resurrection, in that "He showed Himself alive after His Passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of (the Apostles) forty days:"<sup>r</sup> "For if we believe that JESUS died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in JESUS will GOD bring with Him."<sup>s</sup> Thus the chief argument in support of the doctrine is that of authority, the witness of Apostles and the prediction

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 20—23.<sup>m</sup> 2 Tim. i. 10.<sup>n</sup> Is. xxvi. 19.<sup>o</sup> Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14.<sup>p</sup> Dan. xii. 2, 3.<sup>q</sup> S. John v. 28, 29.<sup>r</sup> Acts i. 3.<sup>s</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 14.

of Prophets. It was thus that it was recommended to the acceptance of believers in a portion of GOD'S revelations by the Apostles themselves:<sup>1</sup> their authority is secured now, as of old, by our recognition of much of their predictions having been strictly fulfilled: and, if the special announcement of the Gospel be not accepted, its power and efficacy is denied.

Argument  
from Nature  
for the Re-  
surrection.

§. 2. But though the believer accepts the blessed hope of the Resurrection on the basis of Divine Authority, are there no reasons, derivable from the natural order of things, which may be alleged in support of it? It would appear probable. "For we do not read of GOD'S having wrought any miracle in this world contrary to nature; but sacred history narrates, that the manifestations of Divine power of whatever kind were made by natural causes ministering and effecting them, GOD'S commandment putting them in motion. And if the general resurrection of the dead is the miracle of miracles, the greatest example whereof preceded in CHRIST, insomuch that nearly all other natural arguments are rightly understood to have been effected in His prefiguring; is it to be supposed not to agree with the truth, that we think that the Resurrection will be from the effective power of natural causes subject to the Divine Will?"<sup>2</sup> I would suggest that they who have held that souls are in a state of unconsciousness after death took a long step towards denying the resurrection of the body. It is possible that the soul retains after death some relic of the body, a pledge as it were of the resuscitation of the latter, though it may be subject to change or development. (Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*, II. c. 27.) If this be granted, the universal belief of the vulgar in the appearance of ghosts bodily, (sanctioned I conceive by S. Matthew xxvii. 52, 53, and by Acts xii. 15,) finds support; as doth a reciprocal action of body and soul, evinced by another belief in the spiritual analogues of bodies and material objects, common to the ancient Etrurians and Americans, as to the modern Siberians and Chinese.

Another reason proceeds on the ground, that the Creator of the Universe made Man to partake of intellectual life, and

<sup>1</sup> Acts ii. 24—32, xii. 30—37.

<sup>2</sup> Johan. Scotus Erigena, *De Divisione Naturæ*, Lib. v. p. 247.

having become a spectator of His magnificence and wisdom in all things to continue so for ever according to His intention, and agreeably with the nature assigned to him. The cause of Man's origin is a guarantee for his continual permanence, and his permanence engages his resurrection, without which Man would not be permanent.\* The sense of justice and of retribution, which men universally entertain, leads to the same conclusion. GOD is just, and rewards those that wait for Him. If then the soul alone contended in the struggles of virtue, it would also be alone crowned; and if it alone wallowed in sinful pleasures, it alone would be justly punished. But since neither had they their being separate, nor hath the soul pursued virtue or vice apart from the body, justly shall both also together meet with their retribution.

§. 3. Holy Scripture expressly teaches that a day or *period* shall come, called 'the day of GOD,' when "the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements melt with fervent heat" to make room for "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 *Peter* iii. 12.) A special and supreme effort of Satan shall prevail in the person of a mysterious impostor, the rival of GOD, who, 'exalting himself above all that is called GOD,' above all authorities religious or civil, shall exercise 'a strong delusion on those who believe not the truth.' This Antichrist, (of whom Manes, Mahomet, Mormonism, &c. are imperfect types,) shall be destroyed with the brightness of the coming of the LORD JESUS, when He shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that obey not His Gospel; when He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, and judge all nations; and they that have done good shall go into life eternal, but they that have done evil into eternal punishment. (2 *Thess.* ii. 4, 11, 8. i. 7, 28. *S. Matt.* xxv. 31, 32, 46. *S. John* v. 29.) Thus much is dogmatic truth. Old divines would fain localise the judgment, so that, as Christ ascended from Mount Olivet, so will He come down near the scene of His Passion, (the opinion of Aquinas and all the Schoolmen, except Lombard and Alexander Hales.)

Of the Last  
Judgment.

\* *Vide* Athenagoras, De Resurrectione Mortuorum, *ad calc.* S. Justini Opp. p. 54.

But I forbear ; yet warn the reader that the same term *aionios* is equally applied by S. Matthew to the reward or punishment of the judged. If the notion of an everlasting Hell be rejected, as in excess of the demerits of the vast majority of men, it seems that an everlasting Heaven must also be beyond the congruous merits of the saved.

The effects  
of the Re-  
surrection in  
the Saints.

§. 4. Now if we inquire into the effects of the Resurrection, we shall find that they are excellently comprised in the definition given of it by Nyssen. It is none other than “the restoration of our nature into its pristine condition. In that first life, of which GOD Himself was the Maker, there was neither old age nor infancy, nor the sufferings that attend various infirmities, nor aught beside of corporeal misery ; for it was not likely that GOD should create such things ; but human nature was a divine thing, before it became subject to the impulse of evil, and all these things swept in upon us with the entering of evil.”<sup>¶</sup> We are then led to expect a reversal of all the evil that has attended the fall of the first Adam ; “and as we have borne the image of the earthy,” in the decay and corruption and death engendered by sin, “we shall also bear the image of the heavenly,” in power and glory and incorruption.<sup>¶</sup> Further than this we are not led, nor are we informed of details. We are told indeed that “there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body ;”<sup>¶</sup> that ‘that which is natural is first,’ “and afterward that which is spiritual ;”<sup>¶</sup> we are reminded, “that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of GOD ; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.”<sup>¶</sup> We are told that the LORD JESUS CHRIST at His second coming “shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself.”<sup>b</sup> But we are not to speculate on details, for S. John writes ; “Beloved, now are we the sons of GOD, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be : but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him ; for we shall see Him as He is.”<sup>c</sup>

¶ De Anima et Resurrectione,  
Opp. T. I. p. 684.

<sup>¶</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 49, 42, 43.

<sup>¶</sup> *Ib.* v. 44.

<sup>¶</sup> *Ib.* v. 46.

<sup>¶</sup> *Ib.* v. 50.

<sup>b</sup> Phil. iii. 21.

<sup>c</sup> 1 S. John iii. 2.—It is strange that Jerome, who so clearly exposed the absurdity of the Millennarians,

But a deep mystery is hinted at by S. Paul, when he says ; " And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the SON also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that GOD may be all in all." <sup>d</sup> The change of human nature into GOD is not to be estimated by the loss of substance, but it will be a wonderful and ineffable return into its pristine state, which it lost by transgression. For if everything which purely understands is made one with that which is understood, what marvel if our nature, when it shall behold GOD face to face in them that are worthy, (as far as it is granted to it to behold, being to ascend in the clouds of contemplation), may become one with Him and in Him ?" <sup>e</sup> So one of the Christian Apologists writes ; " The Sovereign GOD will, when He pleases, restore to its original state the substance which to Him alone is visible ; that, as incorruption is with GOD, in like manner Man having been made partaker of GOD <sup>f</sup> might also have immortality." <sup>g</sup> " I am persuaded by the arguments of the wise," says Nazianzen, " that every soul that loves GOD, when loosed from the body she has departed hence, being forthwith conscious of the good that awaits her, (as if that which darkens her had been purged off, or put aside, or I know not how to express it), rejoices with a wonderful pleasure and goes cheerfully to her LORD ; having escaped from this life as it were a cruel prison, and shaken off the fetters whereby the wing of the intellect was pulled down : and already in imagination she enjoys the blessedness in store for her. And a little while after, having also recovered from the earth (that gave it and was entrusted with it) her kindred flesh, wherewith she meditated the things to come in the way that GOD knows Who connected and dissolved them, she inherits in company with it the glory of the other world. And as owing to their community of nature she partook of

should yet be found to write thus : " Igitur, juxta ecclesiarum traditiones et Apostolum Paulum, illud est respondendum ; quod in virum perfectum et in mensuram ætatis plenitudinis Christi resurrecturi sumus, in qua et Adam Judæi conditum autumant, et Dominum Salvatorem legimus surrexisse : et

multa quæ de utroque Testamento in suffocationem hæretici protuli." (Ep. 27, ad Eustochium, T. I. p. 80.)

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 28.

<sup>e</sup> Erigena, p. 232.

<sup>f</sup> Θεοῦ μοίραν μεταλαβὼν See 2 S. Peter i. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Tatian. Contra Græcos Oratio, ad calcem S. Justinii M. Opp. p. 146.

its troubles, so also she imparts to it her delights; having absorbed it into herself, and become with it one spirit and intellect and GOD, what is flux and mortal having been swallowed up of life." <sup>b</sup> The rationale of this statement is supplied by Maximus: "For as the flesh was swallowed up of corruption through sin, and the soul rendered earthy in its operations was swallowed up of the flesh, and the knowledge of GOD lost by the soul through consummate ignorance, so that it knew not even if GOD were: so in every way at the period of the resurrection, according to the beneficial change in the HOLY GHOST, the flesh will be swallowed of the soul in spirit through the grace of our Incarnate GOD; but the soul will be swallowed up of GOD, Who is truly Life; inasmuch as the whole soul will manifestly have Him her most singular All in all." <sup>1</sup>

S. Ambrose, expounding the parable of the leaven, <sup>j</sup> and applying the three measures of meal to the body, soul, and spirit of Man, proceeds; "If then in this life the three measures remain in the same leaven, until they be fermented and become one, so that there be no distance of equal proportions, there will be in future to them that love CHRIST an uncorrupt communion, for we who are at present compounded shall be transformed into one substance. For in the resurrection one thing shall not be lower than the other, as at present the flesh is frail, and the bodily habit of our nature is open to wounds, or subject to injuries, or depressed by its own weight cannot lift up its step above the ground; but we shall be fashioned into the grace of a simple creature, when that which is said of John shall have been completed; 'Beloved, now are we the sons of GOD, and it hath not yet been revealed what we shall be; but we know, that, when it hath been revealed, we shall be like unto Him.' Therefore since GOD's nature is simple (for GOD is spirit), we too shall be fashioned into the same image; that, as is the heavenly, such also may they be that are heavenly." <sup>k</sup>

Probably a difference of rewards will be maintained even

<sup>b</sup> S. Greg. Nazianzen. Orat. x. in laudem Casarii, Opp. T. I. p. 173.

<sup>j</sup> S. Luke xiii. 21.

<sup>1</sup> S. Maximus, *ap.* Erigenam, p.

<sup>k</sup> S. Ambros. In Lucam Lib. vii. §. 194, Tom. I. p. 1458.

where all drink of the well of life and are replenished with the fulness of joy ; for the Church has long ago condemned the attempt to “ abrogate the degrees of diverse merits, and bring in a certain poverty of Divine remunerations, as if CHRIST had but one palm to bestow, and very many titles to rewards did not abound.”<sup>1</sup> The Parable of the Talents points that way ; and the verse “ There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars : for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead ”<sup>m</sup> is usually applied to this distinction of future glory. And although the design of S. Paul’s illustration seems rather to be to establish the credibility of another condition of body than what we are at present acquainted with ; yet it falls in with that we may glean elsewhere. For our LORD reckons some in the kingdom of heaven, to others He promises the inheritance of the earth, to others that they shall see GOD.<sup>n</sup> “ And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour.”<sup>o</sup>

§. 5. It is not expedient to enter on the minute speculations, which a close adherence to the letter of Scripture hath given rise to. Who, for example, can decide for us, what is symbolical or what is real in the Scriptural prefigurations of the end, when ‘ the mystery of God ’ shall be ‘ finished ? ’<sup>p</sup> As I would not venture to assert that all the physical details respecting the happiness of the blessed are inadmissible ; so would I commend caution with regard to the physical character of the punishment of the reprobate. But the spiritual view of it, analogously to what has been stated before of the nature of eternal life, is, that it will be the grief and sadness of the ungodly touching the absence and loss of the things, wherewith they were pleased in this life ; the phantasies whereof they will as it were ever have before their eyes ; the which ardently desiring to embrace they shall be unable, since they are nought ; desiring to have consolation of those things, which bring on despair and disquietude. Hence

Of the punishment of the Reprobate.

<sup>1</sup> Rescript. Episcop. Ambrosii, &c., ad Siricium P.P. ap. Labbe, T. II. p. 1024.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.

<sup>n</sup> S. Matt. v. 3-10.—*Vid.* S. Methodii Conviv. Virginum, p. 103.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 8.

<sup>p</sup> Rev. x. 7.



arises repentance that is too late, and a beseeching for comfort that is unavailing.<sup>a</sup> S. Ambrose, commenting on the words 'There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth,'<sup>r</sup> says: "What is the outer darkness? Are there any prisons and dungeons to be there undergone? By no means. But whoever are outside of the promises of the heavenly commandments are in outer darkness, for the commandments of GOD are light; and whoever is without CHRIST is in darkness, for CHRIST is light in the darkness. There is neither then any gnashing of bodily teeth, nor any perpetual fire of bodily flames, nor is the worm corporeal. But these are therefore set down, because, as both fevers and worms are bred of much surfeit, so, if a man doth not stay his sins as it were by interposing some sobriety of abstinence, but by mingling sins with sins contracts as it were a surfeit of old and recent offences, he shall be burnt by his own fire and be consumed by his own worms. Whence too Esaias saith; 'Walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled.'<sup>s</sup> The fire is that which sorrow for offences begets; it is a worm for this reason, that the sins of the irrational soul sting the mind and feeling of the guilty and eat out certain bowels of conscience, which are bred like worms out of each sin, as though out of the body of the sinner. Lastly, the LORD hath declared it by Esaias, saying; 'They shall look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against Me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched.'<sup>t</sup> The gnashing of teeth also betrays the feeling of one that is indignant, for that it repenteth him too late; too late he bemoans himself; too late he is wroth with himself, that he hath sinned so obstinately."<sup>u</sup>

Of its  
Eternity.

§. 6. As the speculations of Origen touching the termination of hell-torments and of death have lately been freely indulged in, I desire to draw attention to the following considerations, namely, that the question mainly turns on 1. the

<sup>a</sup> Erigena, p. 288.

<sup>r</sup> S. Luke xiii. 28.

<sup>s</sup> Isa. l. 11.

<sup>t</sup> *Ibid* lxi. 24.

<sup>u</sup> S. Ambros. in Lucam, Lib. vii.

§§. 204—206, T. I. p. 1460.—So Damascene describes the eternal fire, οὐχ ὑλικόν, οὐκ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰδείν δ' ὁμοῦ. (*cap. ult.*)

nature of Eternity ; 2. the cause of the continuance of punishment after death.

1. If Eternity be an ever-present Now, 'a circular duration, whose instants are always,' (see above, p. 88,) it appears that the damned, bearing their sins with them out of Time into Eternity, are, upon this hypothesis, involved in a circle from which there is no escape. If, again, we admit succession in Eternity, understanding it as a never-ending succession of *æons* or ages, what ground have we for supposing that what once enters its domain can terminate any more than the endless Time, which is Eternity on that supposition ?

2. If the cause of the everlasting continuance of the punishment of the reprobate be (as the Schoolmen maintain) the infinite sinfulness of sin, by reason of the infinite nature of GOD, Whom sin outrages, there is no ground to expect its cessation. If, again, the cause be the voluntary impenitence of the damned themselves, the doctrine of the power of Habit, (as insisted on by Butler,) translated into a state of endless Time, affords little ground for hope. And if Evil belongs to the region of eternal verities, it will surely abide there.

On the other hand may be pleaded the notion, that Evil being finite and a negation rather than a positive entity, and a shadow attendant on sin, its limits may be traversed, as when the moon disappears behind the driving clouds, and again emerges, bright as ever. Believing that the soul is indiscerptible and indestructible, I must in any case reject the notion of its annihilation. "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease." (*Job* xiv. 7.) Yet *hope* as we will, Good and Evil are antithetical in our very conception of them.

Eternal *rest* implies its opposite unrest and trouble. Light *perpetual* suggests the contrast of darkness, or of intermittent light. If fire illumines, it also consumes. And "our GOD is a consuming fire." Terrible thought, if that which makes up to the saved the Beatific Vision of GOD prove an eternal blasting to the lost ! I would urge with tenderness and awe, how that when the world lay in wickedness the FATHER so loved it as to give His Only-Begotten to

K K

save it, and that the WORD Who created it became Man and died for it. Hence we infer how heinous is the sin that tramples on such love, and also how the violation of it implies a conscious knowledge and rejection thereof. (See above, pp. 301-333.)

Enough that GOD can do nothing but what is good and just. We will respect the KING's secret, and lay aside contentions about the uncertain.

The Conclusion.

§. 7. The sure ground we have is, that GOD "will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." \* Therefore, to conclude with S. Ambrose; "let us be preachers of the LORD, and praise Him in the sound of the trumpet, not thinking slightly and cheaply of His power, but what may fill the ear of the mind and penetrate the secret of the inmost conscience; so that we may not suppose that those things which suit the body are to be applied to Divinity; nor measure the greatness of Divine power by human strength, so as to seek, how each man may rise again, or with what kind of body he may come, or how things loosened may come together, things lapsed be repaired; for these, as soon as they are determined, are fulfilled by the will of GOD. Neither look we for a sensible hearing of trumpets, but the invisible power of the heavenly magnificence operates, for with GOD to will stands for doing; nor is an effort of the resurrection to be required, but its fruit to be sought for by us." †

LAUS DEO.

\* Rom. ii. 6-9.

† De Fide Resurrectionis, Lib. ii. §. 114, Tom. II. p. 1165.

## GENERAL INDEX.

---

ABRAHAM'S Bosom, 461.  
 Absolution, Power of, consequent on the Incarnation, 428.  
*Achamoth*, The *Æon*, 209.  
 Adam, Mankind summed up in, 241.  
*Æons*, Doctrine of, 75, 89, 124.  
 Ailly, Peter D', his singular sentiment, 69.  
 Amiel, H. F., cited, xiii., 229, 310.  
 Angel defined, 179.  
 Angels, Dignity of, 178.  
 —, Guardian, 186, 7.  
 —, Their restoration, 197.  
 —, Theories concerning their Fall, 194.  
 —, Influence of, in Nature, 186, 196.  
 —, S. Ambrose on Invocation of, 189, 472.  
 —, Origen on Worship of, 188.  
 Anthropomorphism, 80.  
 Antichrist, a personal, 476.  
 Antiquity, Deference to, not servile, 62, 3.  
*Anomoian* or *Eunomian* party, Error of, 150.  
 Apperception, Theory of, 228.  
 Apocrypha, The Fathers on the, 19.  
 —, what in the sense of the Ancients, 17.  
 Apostolic Succession, The, 449.  
*Arianism*, a revival of Polytheism, 113.  
 —, Divisions of, 150.  
 Aristophanes cited, 200.

Arnold of Bonneval cited, 440.  
 Assurance, Doctrine of, 342, 355-8.  
 Atonement, The, its connection with the Eucharist, 285-88.  
 —, Objections to it, 283-85.  
 —, Scripture proofs of the, 274-8.  
 Augustine, S., Authority of, on the doctrines of Grace, x., 336.  
 —, Paradox of, 243.  
 Augustinianism, Objections to, and replies, ix.-xiii., 345-9.  
 Averroës, Opinions of, 88, 95.

BAILEY, Bishop, cited, 417.  
 Baptism administered in jest, 403.  
 —, Connection of, with Penance, 391.  
 — by affusion or by immersion, 405.  
 — by heretics, how allowed by the Church? 401.  
 —, Effects of, in *converted* persons, 364.  
 —, in *nominal* Christians, 366.  
 —, Experience of the New Birth enters into the ancient descriptions of, 361.  
 —, Extreme cases of the efficacy of, 403.  
 —, Lay, 400.  
 —, of Infants, Calvin's peculiar tenet of, 400.  
 —, a point of Church discipline, 405.  
 —, the Seal of Faith, 358.  
 —, Types of, 404.

- Baptizing for the dead, 402, 3.  
 Bardas, The Cæsar, 61.  
 Beasts, Leibniz on the souls of, 222.  
 Berrow, Capel, cited, 223.  
 Bishop, An unbaptized, 402.  
 Bishops numerous in the ancient Church, 304.  
 Boethius cited, 88.  
 Bradwardine cited, 95, 96, 325.  
 Bridget, S., The fifteen Prayers of, 343.  
 Bull, Bishop, cited, 119, 120, 206, 208.  
 —, Some statements of his examined, x.-xi.  
 Burnet, Bishop, cited, 53.  
 Butler, Bishop, cited, 207, 8.  
 Byzantine funeral rites, Sacred character of the baptized shown by the, 404.
- CAJETAN, Card., his wise saying, 332.  
*Calvin* cited, 181, 187, 292, 332, 396, 400, 428.  
 Canus, Melchior, cited, 9, 302.  
 Carpocratian cult, 302.  
*Catenæ Patrum*, Early instances of, 33, 60.  
*Catholic*, Meaning of the term, 299.  
 Chrism, what and why used? 409, 410.  
 CHRIST, Death of, the ground of the Gospel, 275.  
 —, Flesh of, in the Eucharist, quickening, 263, 4.  
 —, Satisfaction of, defined, 278.  
 —, His human nature, how imperfect? 273  
 Christian, Ideal of a true, 325.  
 Christianity, not a mere form of philanthropy, 344.  
 Church, The, its authority in matters of Faith, 31.  
 —, —, its authority impaired in our time, 30.  
 —, —, limited, 50.
- Church, Notes of the, 309.  
 —, *not* disparaged by loss or imperfection of Scripture, 21.  
 —, Two schools of thought always in it, 25.  
 — *Catholic* defined, 297, 302-308.  
 —, Indefectibility of, 810.  
 —, Extent of its Infallibility, 311.  
 —, Unity of, 312.  
*Circumcession* in the TRINITY, Doctrine of, 119.  
*Cena Mense Dominice*, 414.  
 Communion, Daily, 439.  
 — in one kind, 438.  
 Confession and public Penance recommended by S. Augustine, 447.  
 — Seal of, 446.  
 Confirmation, 390.  
 —, of old closely connected with Baptism, 408.  
 —, Various meanings assigned to, 411, 12.  
 Confucius, his teaching, 256.  
 Conservative Church principle, 66.  
 Contarini, Card., on Justification, 350.  
 Conversion, No really sudden, 367.  
 Council, General, defined, 57.  
 —, Authority of, in matters of Faith, 59.  
 Creation defined, 177.  
 —, Days of the, 200.  
 —, Theories of, 198.  
 Creationism, 226.  
 Creed, The, in what sense the rule of Faith, 51.  
 Cromwell, Oliver, a Puritan Saint, 471.
- DEAD, Prayer for the, 463.  
 Death, whether natural to Adam? 238.  
 —, Supposed cases of purgatorial, 479.  
 Development of Doctrine, 63.  
 Devils, Nature of temptation by, 196.

Digby, Kenelm H., quoted, 103.  
 Discipline, Loss of, 448.  
 Dionysius, Pseudo-, on the heavenly hierarchy, 109, 120, 180.  
 Dodwell, Henry, his opinion of the soul, 220.  
 Dogma, All, contained *implicitly* in Scripture, 12.  
 —, Difficulty of, in the Anglican Church, iii.  
 —, maintained against conscience, Atheism, 66.  
 —, ruled by General Councils, not to be questioned, 59.  
 —, what it is, i.  
 Dreams imply the soul's activity, 228.  
 Durandus cited, 4-6, 8-10, 16, 50-51, 63, 174, 205, 332, 365, 385, 406, 408, 9, 411.  
 'ECCLESIA *docens*' opposed to Tradition, 64.  
*Egregori*, The, 195.  
 Elect, Distinctive gift bestowed on the, 255.  
 —, Number of the, 342-44.  
 Election, its cause inscrutable, 344, 347.  
*Enoch*, *The Book of*, 195.  
 Episcopate, The, a bond of unity, 306, 454.  
 —, Authority of the primitive, in matters of Faith, 54, 55.  
 Erasmus cited, 256.  
 Erigena, John Scotus, cited, 173-4, 199, 232.  
 Eternity, Notions of, 87, 90.  
 — of the world, Prospective, whether a heresy? 89.  
 Eucharist, Change in the, of what sort? 422.  
 —, Consecration of, how effected, 419.  
 —, How a figure of Christ's Body and Blood? 418.  
 —, In what sense offered for the dead? 435.  
 —, representative, 416.

Eucharist, Sacrifice of the, 433-35.  
 —, Spiritual partaking of the, 440.  
 Eugubinus, Augustinus Steuchus, 90.  
 Eunapius cited, 7.  
 Eusebius, Heresy of, 126.  
*Evening*, *The Lord of the*, 197.  
 Evil, Speculations concerning the origin of, 191, 194, 209-14.

#### FAITH, Definitions of, 5, 6.

—, Gift of, under two dispensations, 253, 6.  
 —, Historical, 6.  
 —, Its *formal* cause, 6.  
 —, Justifying, 358.  
 —, Socinus's scorn of, 357.  
 —, Nicene, accords with Scripture, 13.  
 —, Petavius on the Rule of, 30.  
 —, presupposes Reason short of demonstration, 4.  
 —, supernatural, 10.  
 Fate, Definitions of, 204, 5.  
 Fathers, Characteristics of the early, 39-41.  
 FILIOQUE Clause, Historical sketch of the, 166-174.  
 Fowler, Bishop, cited, 256.  
 Future state, Difference of rewards in the, 479.

#### GAMBOLD (Moravian bishop) cited, 228.

Gerard of Hungary, 8., 428.

Gibbon cited, xi., 7, 120, 318.

#### GOD, Argument for the existence of, 70.

—, Attributes of, 72-4, 76-8.  
 —, Eternity of, 87.  
 —, Immutability of, not contradicted by the Eternal Generation of the WORD, 85, 6.  
 —, Impossibility of knowing Him in His Essence, 82.  
 —, Knowledge of, divinely bestowed, 71.

- GOD, Opinions of the Arabian philosophers on, 95.  
 —, Rudimental character of our knowledge of, 68.  
 —, Digby's notion of the Love of, 103.  
 —, Names of, 104-106.  
 —, Omnipresence of, 90-92.  
 —, Pantheistic idea of, 83.  
 —, Purposes of, not limited to Man, 86.  
 —, Simplicity of His Nature, 78.  
 —, Unity of, 84.  
 —, Will of, antecedent and consequent, 101.  
 Gordon, General, 184, 429.  
 Grace, effectual or sufficient? 326.  
 —, Insufficiency of Man without, 244, 353, 368.  
 —, The Covenant of, 353, 361.  
 Gregory the Great, S., his gloomy anticipations and Purgatorian theories, xxviii., 316, 481.
- HALES, Alex. De, cited, 23.  
 Harmony, Leibniz's theory of pre-established, applied, 224, 327.  
 Heathen, Possible salvation of pious, 256, 349.  
 Heathendom, Saints of, 257.  
 Heaven, our *home*, 229.  
 Hell, Calvin's theory of Christ's Descent into, 292.  
 Herbert, Sir Thomas, cited, 256.  
 Hierarchies, The Angelic, 179-184.  
 Hierarchy, The Ecclesiastical, its origin, 449-53.  
 —, its object, 453.  
 HOLY GHOST, Scripture proofs of the Divinity of the, 158-66.  
 —, Mission of, 174-76.  
 —, Personality of the, 162-6.  
 —, Procession of the, 166-174.  
*Homoian* or pure Arian party, Error of the, 150.  
*Homoiousian* or Semi-Arian party, Error of the, 150.
- Homo-ousios*, The term, 139-43.  
 Honorius of Autun cited, 346.  
 Hooker's last thoughts, 182.  
*Hortulus Animæ*, The, 343.  
 Hughes, Bishop, 291.  
 Humanists, Their hostility to Christianity, 7, 302.  
*Hypostasis*, The term, when equivalent to that of *Ousia*, 115.  
*Hypostases* or *Persons*, Orthodox meaning of the term, 116.  
*Hypostatic* Union of Natures in Christ, 262, 267, 269.
- IDEA*, *Archetypal*, Christ the true, 99.  
 —, —, Plato's doctrine of the, 98.  
 Ideas, Innate, 2, 217.  
*Idiomatum*, *Communicatio*, 122, 265, 7.  
 Image and Likeness of God, what? 216, 244.  
 'Image of God,' The LOGOS the, 142.  
 Incarnation, Heresies opposed to the, 260, 1.  
 —, Orthodox statements of the, 261-2.  
 —, Preludes of the, 249.  
 Intermediate state, The, 458-62.
- JACKSON, Dr. Thomas, cited, v., 20, 22, 26, 62, 257, 316, 318.  
 Jansenius too well reflects Augustine, 326, 336.  
 Jehuda the Holy, Rabbi, 256.  
 Joachim, Error of the Abbat, 130.  
 Judgment, The last, xiii., 491, 2.  
 Julian, The Emperor, 443.  
 Justification by Faith, 351-4.  
 —, how a corrective? 358.  
 —, in Christ, 277, 350.  
 —, Its connection with Baptism, 358-61.  
 —, Tridentine view of, 352.

*Koran*, The, cited, 10, 89, 194, 256,  
447, 467, 476, 479.

*Kosmos nôeros*, The, 151.

LANCELOTTI, John Paul, cited;  
362-4, 384, 400, 402, 412, 453.

Latin essential to the clergy, xvi.

*Latreia*, Caution touching, 267.

Laud, Archbishop, cited, ix., xvi.

—, His merit, vii.

Law, The ceremonial, 251, 52.

— of Moses, 249-50.

Leibniz cited, 2, 59, 64, 83, 102,  
179, 208, 213, 217, 218, 222,  
228, 237, 244, 254, 326, 330, 31,  
333, 336, 347, 49, 377, 474.

Leporius, Error of, 129.

Lightfoot cited, 459.

*Limbus Patrum*, The, 291.

Liturgies, Authority of, in contro-  
versies of Faith, 51, 53.

LOGOS, Eternal Generation of  
the, 137-39.

—, Scripture proofs of the Divinity  
of the, 143-49.

—, Texts alleged against the  
Divinity of the, 151-6.

—, The Ante-Nicene Fathers on  
the, 133-6.

Lucidus, His Profession of Faith,  
253.

Lucretius cited, 238.

Ludlow, Edmund, cited, 471.

Luther, cited, 238.

—, His mode of Appeal determines  
nothing, 59.

MABILLON cited, v., xiii., 50, 109,  
131, 168, 280, 286, 378, 406,  
409, 428, 457, 8, 461, 465.

Maimonides cited, 69, 77, 82, 110,  
194, 201, 202, 206, 208.

Man, Education of, before the  
Gospel, 248, 9.

— in a state of degradation, 2,  
223, 237.

—, Relations of, with the uni-  
verse, 347.

Man. Threefold nature of, 218-  
222.

Manichæism, its power, 213.

'*Mansions*' what? 483.

Marcos, M. Paul, 3, 123.

Martin, Gregory, cited, 292..

Mary, Perpetual Virginity of B.V.,  
43.

—, Whether sinless? 372.

Matrimony, 394.

Matter, Eternity of, 89, 197.

—, Original imperfection of, 210,  
213, 235.

Menander cited, 188.

'*Merit*,' Meaning of the term,  
370.

Merits of the Saints not to be  
denied, 370.

Methodius, S., on Souls after  
death, 486.

Mill, John Stuart, 210.

*Millennium*, The, its relation to  
Saint-worship, 487.

—, Gross views of the, 485.

Milton, John, cited, xxxi.

Ministry, The Orders of the sacred,  
454.

Miracles, Burmann's view of,  
207.

— Difference between true and  
false, 317.

—, Durandus' maxim on, 205.

—, Bishop Butler on, 207.

—, Maimonides on, 206.

—, probably not confined to the  
primitive Church, 318.

— reconcilable with Natural  
Order, 317.

—, The Note of, considered, 312-  
19.

Miracle of the African confessors,  
318.

Mixed Cup, Symbolism of the,  
438.

More, Henry, cited, 213, 219, 222,  
3, 228, 233.

Mozley, J. B., cited, xiv.

Music, its design, 218.

Mysterious, Modern repugnance  
to the, xii.



'*NATIONAL Church*,' a barbarous term, and of sinister origin, 307.

Nativities, The *three*, of the Word, 136.

Nature, The Human, in Christ, imperfect, 273.

Natures in Christ, Union of, 261.

Natural religion, 1, 242, 4, 247.

'*Notion*,' The term, defined, 127.

Newman, Card., his merit in relation to Gibbon and Walter Scott, vii.

OLD TESTAMENT dispensation, Mystery of the, 252.

'*Opus operatum*,' 407, 20.

Oracles, the guides of the heathen, 257.

Order, Sacrament of, 392.

Origen, Socinian doctrine expressed by, 126, 134.

Original Sin defined, 235.

—, Transmission of, 238-42.

PANORMITAN cited, 58, 412, 453.

Pantheism in the Middle Ages, 83.

— taught by Pliny, 79.

Paradise, Account of, symbolical, 231.

Pattison, Mark, cited, xiii., xxvi., 6, 257, 302, 337, 344, 447.

'*Peculiar People*,' The, 396.

Pelagians, The, disciples of Origen, 271.

— involved in Nestorius' condemnation, 271.

Penance, 391, 442.

Perfection, Christian, of what kind? 372.

*Peris*, Suggestive legend of the, 195.

Perséverance of the Elect, 340.

PERSONS, Special Attributes of the Divine, 120-4.

—, Subordination of, 127-9.

—; Priscillianist error respecting it, 75.

PERSONS, witnessed to by the Book of Common Prayer, 129.

—; The Latin Church *avoids* it, 156.

Peter, S., Primacy of, 305-8.

'Pharisees' belief in astrology, 204.

Philo cited, 98.

Philosophy, Greek, employed by the early Fathers, 132-5.

—, Poverty of the later Hellenic, 7.

Photinus, Heresy of, 150.

Plato cited, 68, 98, 199.

Poirée, Gilbert De la, Error of, 76.

Polytheism, Origin of, 2.

*Popol-Vuh*, The, cited, 3.

Power of the Keys, what? 442-3, 448.

Predestinarians, Mediæval, 326, 342.

Predestination defined, 322.

—, Objections to, 327-35.

— of the Soul of JESUS, 270-73.

Predestinations, Attempted distinction of *two*, 324.

Pre-existence of the Soul considered, 222-5.

—, Objections to it, and their Answers, 225.

—, Imagination suggests it, 228.

—, S. Augustine's theory of, 224.

—, Leibniz's theory of, 228.

Presence, The Real, in the Eucharist, 420, 427.

—, how effected? 419.

Processions, The Divine, 113, 114.

Progress after Death, Law of, 483, 86.

*Protestant* position of Anglican Church, 307.

Providence, Objections against a particular, 203-4.

Punishment after Death, its eternity, 496.

—, Spiritual view of, 495.

—, Purgatorial, Earliest notices of, 477.

—, S. Basil's view of, 480.

—, Origen's view of, 478.

—, Tertullian's view of, 479.

RADBOD king of the Frisians, story of, 256.  
 Reason defined, 1.  
 — concerned with the grounds of Faith, 2.  
 — not opposed to the supernatural, 4.  
 Reformation, Duties and Perils of, 65, 67.  
 —, Fatal effect of the, 307, 312.  
 —, Principle of Church, 65.  
 Regeneration, an inchoate act, 361.  
 —, when equivalent to Baptism? 359-61.  
 'Relations' in the Holy Trinity, Meaning of, 117.  
 Religion, Christian, objective in its origin, 8.  
 —, positive, not empirical, 6.  
 Reprobation, inscrutable, 331.  
 —, not absolute, 333.  
 Resurrection defined, 492.  
 — inferred from the finite nature of Evil, 492.  
 — of CHRIST, a pledge of ours, 293.  
 —, The miracle of miracles, 490.  
 —, Why more clearly revealed at the close of the Old Testament? 489.  
*Rig-Veda*, The, cited 7.  
 Rubric, The *black*, 428.

SACRAMENTS, Analogies of the, 396.  
 Sacrifices, Human, their true motive, 279.  
 Saints, Imperfection of, 373.  
 —, Intercession of, 314, 466-71.  
 —, —, upheld by Puritans, 471.  
 —, Invocation of, Origin and growth of, 471-75.  
 —, —, *poetry*, 476.  
 —, —, Resolution respecting it, 475-6.  
 —, Perfection of, 371-3.  
 Satisfaction for sin by blood, a ruling idea of old, 279.

Satisfaction, Theories of CHRIST's, 278.  
 —, —, True nature of, 279.  
 Savage Man, no disproof of the Scripture account, 2.  
 Schism of the East and West, xii. *Scientia Media*, 197.  
 Scotus, Duns, cited, 15, 44.  
 Scott, Sir Walter, referred to, 197.  
 Scripture, Appeal of Catholics to, rather than to Tradition, 12.  
 —, Damascene on, 27.  
 —, Gregory the Great on, 26.  
 —, Ground of our belief in, 5.  
 —, How the Word of God? 51.  
 —, Mystic sense of, 24.  
 —, Paramount excellence of, 63.  
 —, The Canon of, 16.  
 —, —, Patristic Rule concerning it, 17.  
 —, The Church's Rule, 14, 59.  
 —, The Rule of Faith, 12-16, 39, 51, 61.  
 —, Triple sense of, 23, 4.  
 Secrecy, The Discipline of, 47-50.  
 Semi-Pelagians, Views of the, 327-9.  
 Separation on account of false doctrine, not Schism, 66.  
*Sephiroth*, Rabbinical notion of the, 75.  
 Septuagint, Augustine on the authority of the, 21.  
 —, Thorndike's view of the, 22.  
 Sirmond, Jacques, cited, 411.  
 Socinian view of Christ, 271.  
 Soul and Spirit, Distinction of, 220.  
 Souls never without a relic of the body, 490.  
 Spinoza, his tenets, 83, 207.  
 Spirit, Definition of a, 81.  
 Spirits, The, in prison, 254, 290, 349, 479.  
 Staël, Mme. De, cited, II Pref. iii. 67.  
 Stanley, Dean, on Arianism, 113.  
 State, Relations of Church and, 456-7.  
*String*, The *broken*, 184.

- TABOR, Mount, Uncreated light of, 61, 90.
- Tachard, Guy, cited, 256.
- Talmud, The, cited, 256, 467, 479.
- Tertullian's paradox, 266.
- Tetragrammaton, The, 104.
- Theandric Operation, The, 267, 8, 426.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia, Rationalism of, 211.
- Theology defined, 8.
- cannot be secured by Patronage, 61.
- not properly a science, 9.
- speculative and practical, 8.
- , The principles of Faith reasoned out, 8.
- , The Church may employ new terms in, 10.
- Theophilus of Antioch, Strange statement of, 135.
- Theotokos, The term, 268.
- Thorndike cited, *passim*.
- , Value of his writings, viii.
- Tradition defined, 33.
- acknowledged by Church of England, 36.
- , Early channels of Catholic, 33, 4, 60.
- , How the Rule of Faith? 37, 39, 64.
- Traditions, Apostolical, Examples of alleged, 41, 2.
- , —, Church usages so termed, 45-7.
- Traducianism, 225-6.
- Transsubstantiation, 10, 422, 426.
- spiritually understood, 428.
- 'Trine Deity,' The term, 131.
- TRINITY, The HOLY, American tradition of, 124.
- , The doctrine of, Its development, 109, 14, 16.
- TRINITY, The HOLY, Summary of it, 107.
- , Image of it in Man, 125.
- , Physical illustrations of it, inadequate, 120.
- UNCONSCIOUS, The, Philosophy of, 337.
- Uction of the sick, 395.
- Unity of the Godhead, not collective, but substantial, 130.
- VAUGHAN, Henry, cited, 229.
- Veddaha, case of the, 2.
- Vincent of Lerins' Rule, and its defect, 34, 6, 60, 62, 68.
- Virgil cited, 82.
- Virtue, Outlines of, 243.
- WAY, The narrow, 343.
- Will of God, *Voluntas beneplaciti*, 100.
- , *Voluntas signi*, 100.
- Will, Man's, how far free? 337, 377, 381.
- Williams, Archbishop, on the Eucharist, 435.
- Wisdom defined by Origen, 10.
- Wordsworth, Wm., cited, 229.
- Works, Faith and, 374, 5.
- Worlds, Plurality of, S. Augustine on, 201.
- XAVIER, S. Francis, 253, 4, 349.
- Xenias, Case of, 402.
- YEZIDEES, The, 197.

THE END.

sp



32101 063702623

